THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CVI.] OCTOBER, 1853. [Vol. IX.

NEWMAN'S PHASES OF FAITH.*

In *The Christian Reformer* for August 1850, we inserted a review of Newman's *Phases of Faith*, in which, after remarking upon the general character of the book, we endeavoured to answer some of its principal objections to Christianity. A second edition of this work, containing considerable additions and alterations, has lately come into our hands; and we propose to give an account of the new form it has assumed, as far as the changes bear upon opinions we have already expressed.

Before we enter upon the main points to which we wish to direct the attention of our readers, we have a word or two to offer in confirmation of the want of settled judgment we formerly attributed to Mr. Newman. A disposition toward hasty and partial conclusions was very apparent in the first draft of his religious experience which he gave to the world; and on comparing that with this second exposition of the matter, we meet with some singular confirmations of the infirmity. What ought to have been adopted only as the result of the most careful deliberation, is discovered, by the different manner in which it is now stated, to have been ventured upon with even more incautiousness than could be previously ascertained. A few illustrations of this may be useful.

The very material assertion, that "the permission of slaughter to the Jews is not directed against the seven nations of Canaan only," but "is a *universal* permission of avaricious massacre and subjugation,"† is *omitted* from the paragraph in which it was contained.

The objection to the character of Jesus involved in the questions, "Could a miracle authorize me to plait a whip of small cords and flog a preferment-hunter out of the pulpit, or would it justify me in publicly calling the Queen and her Ministers 'a brood of vipers who cannot escape the damnation of hell'?" and of which it was said, "Such questions go very deep into the heart of the Christian claims," is acknowledged to be "rather *feebly stated*, because at that period" (the period to which this part of

* Phases of Faith, or Passages from the History of my Creed. By Francis William Newman, formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Second Edition. Pp. 201. London—John Chapman. 1853.

† Phases of Faith, 1st edition, p. 151, note.

the narrative refers) its author "had not fully worked out the thought."*

The sentence that stood, "The moral advantages which we owe to Christianity have been exaggerated by the same party spirit," has been amended by the very significant limitation implied in the appended words, "as if there were in them anything *miraculous*."†

It was formerly said, that "undue credit has been claimed for Christianity as the foe and extirpator of slavery;" but this declaration is at present softened down to the following purport: "*The modern doctrine, by aid of which West-India slavery has been exterminated,* is often put forward as Christian; but I had always discerned that it was not Biblical, and that, in respect to this great triumph, undue credit has been claimed for the fixed Biblical and authoritative doctrine."‡

The charge preferred in the language, "Not only does the Old Testament justify bloody persecution, but the New teaches that God will visit men with fiery vengeance for holding an erroneous creed," is rendered almost innocent by the concession, "I am willing to change *teaches* into *has always been understood to teach,* if my critics think anything is gained by it."§

We have dealt very sparingly with Mr. Newman in confining our notice to these instances of the fluctuation of his sentiments. They are, however, sufficient to prove how uncertain was the view he originally took of the subject of his professed investigation, and how little dependence can be placed upon the conclusions he from time to time adopts.

The principal portion of our former article was directed to the notice of these three points:—The transmission of revealed truth in a historical form; the credibility of the divine manifestation made through Jesus Christ; and the authority which ought to be conceded to Christianity. To each of these points, as they are affected by what Mr. Newman has said in this fresh edition of his work, we will again turn our attention.

First, then, for *the transmission of revealed truth in a historical form.*

We still have a chapter, entitled, as of old, *History discovered to be no Part of Religion,* and containing the same course of remark which had previously appeared. We have re-read it with care; and in spite of great looseness both of statement and argument, we derive from it the opinion we before formed, that it was Mr. Newman's intention to teach the doctrine, that a system of revealed religious truth cannot be made the subject of historical communication. No adequate or apparently adequate reason is offered for this conclusion, and we repeat, that "it is to us

---

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 92, note. † Ibid. p. 102.
‡ Ibid. p. 104. § Ibid. p. 112.

matter of curiosity how any man would go about to shew that history, as distinguished from rational investigation for instance, was disqualified from being the medium through which the character and will of God may be conveyed to mankind."

We thought our curiosity might be gratified when we subsequently found that the question of *Book-revelation* was to be discussed in the *Reply to the Eclipse of Faith*, which this volume contains. Great, however, was our disappointment when, instead of meeting with anything like Book-revelation properly so called, we were confronted with *Authoritative Imposition of Belief concerning Moral Truth*—a ghost which we ourselves had attempted to lay. Certainly, if such imposition had been all that was objected to, no word in reply to the objection would have fallen from us. The doctrine of "an Infallible Bible" we disclaim, and we believe in the inalienable responsibility attaching to man's moral nature. We can therefore fully subscribe to the sentence:

"If an angel from heaven bade me to lie and to steal and to commit adultery and to murder and to scoff at good men, and usurp dominion over my equals, and do unto others everything that I wish not to have done unto me, I ought to reply, *Be thou anathema.*"*

As this is all Mr. Newman has thought proper to defend, we are warranted in concluding that he wishes us to consider the Christian revelation to be bound up with the belief that the Bible imposes such a reception of its dogmas as supersedes the exercise of our own moral faculties on the subject. That, however, is, in our judgment, a libel upon Christianity, and we are prepared to deny its truth even to the extent of rejecting the common doctrine of scriptural inspiration. The opinion before us, then, leaves the question of Book-revelation just where it found it, as far as we are concerned. The miraculous claims of Christianity may still be valid, and the historical form in which those claims are pressed upon us may still be sustainable, though the record of revelation should stand toward us only in the same natural relation which belongs to any other historical record; and when the substantial merits of the case are thus put aside in favour of a theory which rests upon the supernatural character of the Bible, we cannot but infer that that case is virtually given up. We have to complain that, in the instance before us, Christianity is, for the purpose of attack, confounded with an exaggerated representation of orthodoxy; and we feel the more justified in making this complaint, because it is very clear that, at one period of his religious experience, Mr. Newman rested in that distinction between Biblical infallibility and the truth of Christianity which he now disregards.

"I had found out," says he, "that the Bible was not to be my reli-

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 191.

gion, nor its perfection any tenet of mine: but what then? Did Paul go about preaching the Bible? nay, he preached Christ.....In Paul's religion, respect for the Scriptures was a means, not an end. The Bible was made for man, not man for the Bible. Thus the question with me was, 'May I still receive Christ as a Saviour from sin, a Teacher and Lord sent from heaven, and can I find an adequate account of what he came to do or teach?' And my reply was, Yes."*

We do not wish to hold Mr. Newman to the decision thus expressed; but we think his having formed that decision especially forbad him from keeping it out of sight in his discussion of the historical claims of Christianity. If he chose to confine himself to the unnecessary task of shewing that the Bible could not overrule our natural convictions of moral truth, he was bound, in deference to his own experience, to abstain from identifying that doctrine with the very different one, that "History forms no part of Religion."

That we may do no injustice to him on this portion of our subject, we will insert what he has said in professed explanation of the expression last quoted:

"For the sake of any one who is really and honestly stupid as to my meaning, I will here reiterate that when I deny that History can *be* Religion, or *a part of* Religion, I mean it exactly in the same sense in which we all say that History is not Mathematics. 'Newton wrote the Principia:' true: but to make that proposition a part of Mathematics would be an egregious blunder as to the very nature of the science. A man might be quite as good a mathematician, though he had never heard of Newton's name.—In the above, change Newton and Principia into Moses and Pentateuch, or David and Psalms, or Paul and Epistles, and change Mathematics into Religion—and (I say) all remains true. I may be right, or I may be wrong: but I speak most distinctly. Religion and Mathematics alike come to us by Historical Transmission; but where the sciences flourish, we judge of them for ourselves, make them our own, become independent of our teachers, add to their wisdom, and bequeath an improved store to our successors: but these sciences have never flourished and cannot flourish, where received on authority. They come to us *by* external transmission, but are not believed *because of* that transmission; and no historical facts concerning that transmission are any part of the science at all. Mathematics is concerned with relations of Quantities. Religion with the normal relations between Divine and Human nature. *That is all.*"†

This passage is a refusal to admit that relation between History and Religion which is claimed in favour of Christianity. The Christian history professes to develop a *revelation*, not an *investigation* of religious truth. In this essential respect it differs from scientific history. It places before us new facts, not philosophical reasonings. Now Mr. Newman has yet to shew that there is anything unreasonable in that connection of history with religion which is thus asserted. He has so far done nothing

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 86. † Ibid. p. 184.

toward the proof of this point. His objections to the particular form of the Christian history do not touch the rationale of the case; and his argument in favour of the integrity of man's moral nature sets up a false issue in application to that case.

We turn now to *the credibility of that divine manifestation of moral perfection which Christianity attributes to Jesus.*

A whole chapter is, in this second edition of his book, devoted by Mr. Newman to this subject; the additional discussion having been called forth by a paper of Mr. Martineau's which appeared in the *Prospective Review.* We shall simply compare what is said in that chapter with what had been previously said, as it stands related to the view we ourselves gave of the subject. The following paragraph occupied our particular notice:

"It is not fair to ask (as some whom I exceedingly respect do ask) that those who do not admit Jesus to be faultless and the very image of God, will specify and establish his faults. This is to demand that we will *presume* him to be perfect, until we find him to be imperfect. Such a presumption is natural with those who accept him as an angelic being: absurd in one who regards him as a genuine man, with no preternatural origin and power. If by sensible and physical proof the orthodox can show that he is God incarnate, it will be reasonable to assume that he is a perfect specimen of moral excellence, and after this it will be difficult to criticize. But when sensible proof of his immaculate conception and of his Godhead is allowed not to exist, and maintained to be abstractedly impossible, I have no words to express my wonder at that logic, which starts by acknowledging and establishing his simple manhood, proceeds to *presume* his absolute moral perfection, *throws on others the task of disproving the presumption,* and regards their silence as a verification that he is God manifest in the flesh."*

Our reply to this statement was, that those who accept Jesus Christ as the representative of God, do not regard him as one who had "no preternatural origin and power;" for they would stultify themselves if they were to do so. The perfection pleaded for as belonging to him, necessarily includes a supernatural endowment by which the Son of God is placed in the most intimate relations to his Father, and every possible qualification which the inspiration of the Almighty can impart is secured to him. The miraculous conditions which form an essential part of the question make it, as we are here told, "reasonable to assume that Christ is a perfect specimen of moral excellence."

Now the manner in which Mr. Newman has treated this subject in his reply to Mr. Martineau, fully confirms the correctness of the view expressed in the foregoing sentences. He endeavours, we believe erroneously, to fix upon Mr. Martineau the opinion that Christ was *a mere man;* and thence he successfully draws the conclusion, that the presumption is in favour of his being, like other men, the subject of moral infirmity. In occu-

* Phases of Faith, 1st edition, p. 211.

pying this ground, he confesses that the presumption for which he contends would not exist if Christ were believed *not* to be a mere man.

"My arguments will," says he, "to a certain extent be those of an orthodox Trinitarian: since we might both maintain that the belief in the absolute divine morality of Jesus is not tenable, when the belief in *every other* divine and superhuman quality is denied."*

Nor does he leave the matter only in this form. He extends the allowances he had made on the side of those who believe Christ to have been God incarnate or an angelic being, so as to give the benefit of them to others besides Trinitarians and Arians.

"If I were already convinced that this person was a great Unique, separated from all other men by an impassable chasm in regard to his physical origin, I (for one) should be much readier to believe that he was Unique and Unapproachable in other respects: for all God's works have an internal harmony. It could not be for nothing that this exceptional personage was sent into the world. That he was intended as head of the human race, in one or more senses, would be a plausible opinion: nor should I feel any incredulous repugnance against believing his morality to be, if not divinely perfect, yet separated from that of common men so far, that he might be a God to us, just as every parent is to a young child."†

"Not merely strict Trinitarians, but all who believe in the Atonement, however modified—all who believe that Jesus will be the future Judge—*must* believe in his absolute perfection."‡

"As many Unitarians as believe that Jesus is to be the Judge of living and dead (as the late Dr. Lant Carpenter did), must as *necessarily* believe his immaculate perfection as if they were Trinitarians."§

These extracts indicate a conviction of the truth, though they do not express that truth fully. Why should the concession here made, be confined to believers in the miraculous conception of Christ, or in his being the Judge of living and dead, or in the doctrine of his atonement? There is no exclusive qualification bearing upon moral perfection involved in these particular things. Let the obvious necessity of the case be stated in plain language, and it will amount simply to this: that in order to his moral perfection, Jesus Christ must have been supernaturally endowed for that special end. This is required; but no more is required: and those who believe in that perfection, must contend for this as a necessary part of their belief; or they would certainly be liable to the full force of the objections which Mr. Newman urges against their theory. That theory, then, we repeat, is not one with regard to which we feel any responsibility, although the manner in which this part of the subject was originally introduced, seemed to compromise the

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 141.
† Ibid. p. 142.
‡ Ibid. p. 144.
§ Ibid. p. 145.

view of Christ's character which may be distinctly called the Unitarian one. We are glad, however, that we can appeal to Mr. Newman's own testimony, however imperfectly given, to the effect that a belief in the moral perfection of Jesus Christ logically results from such views of his person as we hold; and we thank him for stating so broadly as he has done, that the supernaturalism of Christianity is an impregnable, as well as a necessary justification of the conclusions which are on this topic drawn from it.

We shall not enter upon the specific instances of imperfection which are in the chapter before us alleged against our Saviour. They are quite unworthy of Mr. Newman's sense and feeling, and are at once too weak and too captious to do any harm. It might, indeed, be easily shewn, that they rest for essential support upon a previous disbelief of the divine claims of Christ, and that the mere concession of those claims would be sufficient to clear up all the moral difficulties they present. The main circumstances to which they refer,—such, for example, as the submission to himself which Christ demanded,—were peculiar to his position; and to judge them by the standard of acts of morality, devolving upon us in consistency with our entirely different position, is just to put aside the first principle of fairness relevant to the question in hand. Mr. Newman might have spared himself much trouble, if he had checked his strenuous efforts in favour of the criticism he has produced, by a remembrance of his own declaration on the subject of such criticism:

"In fact, the same action or word in Jesus may be consistent or inconsistent with moral perfection, according to the previous assumptions concerning his person."*

The third point to which our former observation related, was *the authority that ought to be conceded to Christianity.*

Mr. Newman had represented Jesus Christ as requiring from his followers implicit belief, without respect to the rational grounds on which faith should be built; and we endeavoured to shew, that the authority demanded for the facts of Christianity on matters of religion, was, in principle, of the same kind as that which the facts of nature are acknowledged to possess on matters of science. In the one case, as in the other, faith is secured, not by an arbitrary dictation which precludes free thought on the part of those who submit to it, but by such a representation of truth, as the thought accepts in the exercise of its freedom. In carrying out this view of the subject, we quoted certain passages bearing upon the matter in dispute, and contended that all their force was derived from confounding the rational submission really appropriate to the case, with the blind external obedience which did not legitimately belong to it. To one or two of these pas-

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 141.

sages we shall again refer, calling especial attention to the alterations that have been made in them; as it will be seen that these alterations attempt to strengthen Mr. Newman's side of the question, by withdrawing the forms of expression which gave occasion to a more defensible setting forth of the Christian claims than he chooses to admit. Our readers will have to judge whether or not the changes are more conformable to the facts of the subject.

"Jesus requires that they will receive his doctrine (and submit to it as little children) because of his miracles. Now this is intelligible if blind external obedience is the end of religion, and not Truth and inward Righteousness."*

The reference to "little children," which every one must see carries with it the sense of moral submission as distinguished from blind external obedience, is now omitted from the sentence.

"It had always appeared to me very strange in these divines, to insist on the convincing and stupendous character of the Christian miracles, and then in reply to the objection that they were *not* quite convincing, to say that the defect was purposely left 'to try people's Faith.' Faith in what? Not surely in the miracle, but in the truth as discernible by the heart *without aid of miracle*."†

To this it was answered, that—"not quite convincing"—related to the condition of the unbeliever, and not to a want of sufficiency in the evidence offered to him; and it therefore followed that faith in the Christian miracles themselves might rightly be tried by the manner in which they were proposed. Such faith is a moral exercise, not only admitting of trial, but requiring to be tried. This answer is now, however, effectually barred by the change—"Faith in what? Not surely in *the confessedly ill-proved* miracle."‡ But the addition of these words—"confessedly ill-proved"—to the sentence, though it gives a logical consistency to the argument, destroys whatever application it might otherwise have had to the sentiments of those Christian divines with which that argument engages to deal.

"If I *must* sit in judgment on the claims of Jesus to be the true Messiah and Son of God, how can I concentrate all my free thought into that one act and thenceforth abandon free thought? This appears a moral suicide, whether Messiah or the Pope is the object whom we *first* criticize, in order to instal him over us, and *then*, for ever after, refuse to criticize. In short, *we cannot build up a system of Authority on a basis of Free Criticism*."§

The pertinence of this conclusion depends, as we observed, upon the sense given to the word *Authority*, upon which it turns. Every one must immediately perceive that it would not be fair or reasonable to say of Science, "We cannot build up a system

* Phases of Faith, 1st edition, p. 146.
† Ibid. p. 154.
‡ Ibid. 2nd edition, p. 94.
§ Ibid. 1st edition, p. 213.

of authority on a basis of free criticism;" and as the authority claimed for Christianity is of the same character as that conceded to science, the declaration is unfair and unreasonable in its Christian application. There is no more abandonment of free thought in the one instance than there is in the other. On turning to this passage, however, as it appears in the new form of the book, we find an important change in the last sentence, which prevents it from being applied to the kind of authority legitimately belonging to Christianity. It stands thus.

"In short, we cannot build up a system of *Oracles* on a basis of free criticism."*

If Christianity be indeed "a system of Oracles," the decision is a just one; but it is, on the contrary, unjust, in proportion to the propriety with which the authority of Christ can be identified with moral obligation.

We have thus seen that, in each instance to which we have referred, Mr. Newman has, more entirely than before, entrenched himself within the opinion, that arbitrary dictation and blind obedience comprise the true conditions of Christian belief. His position, indeed, absolutely required him to do so; and we commend him for the courage with which he has confined himself to his proper ground. Still it remains to be asked whether that ground is not a mere fancy-land, as far as Christianity is at all interested in it? Such we firmly believe it to be. If Christ did *not* require his disciples to submit to him "as little children;" if Christian divines *do* confess that the miracles of the gospel are "ill-proved," and if "a system of Oracles" *is* a proper designation of the teachings of Jesus, then Mr. Newman is right; but if these things be mere inventions, and not realities, the question of the authority of Christianity remains altogether untouched by his attack.

Our remarks have been almost entirely confined to the personal interest we ourselves have in the work under review; and we think we have proved that, on all the points we have brought forward, this amended attack has simply assaulted positions which our Christian faith does not require us to defend. There, where the battle, if won by him, affords no substantial triumph, our author has brought fresh forces into the field; but here, where the strength of the cause really lies, he has both reduced his troops and relaxed his efforts. The Historical Transmission of Revelation—the Divine Perfection of Jesus—and the Authority due to Christianity,—these things themselves, as far as we understand their nature, are left unassailed, for the sake of an easy victory over fancies and fictions which are disguised in their dress.

We should not like to undertake the task of justifying all that

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 151.

is said in *The Eclipse of Faith;* but we cannot help just referring, in conclusion, to the exceedingly evasive manner in which Mr. Newman treats the objection urged against him by the writer of that book, to the effect that his principles, if consistently carried out, would lead to Atheism. The objection had been thus stated:

"If I acquiesce, on Mr. Newman's grounds, in the rejection of the Bible as a special revelation of God, I am compelled on the very *same* principles to go a few steps farther, and to express doubts of the absolutely divine original of the *World* and the administration thereof, just as he does of the divine original of the Bible."

In this statement we do not concur: but we must protest against the method in which it is met, as involving more important considerations than the quarrel itself presents. Mr. Newman replies by an attack upon the Theism of the man who could conduct such an argument: professing to believe that he is responsible for the atheistical conclusions which he declares to be the natural result of principles he rejects. It is hardly credible that any one could have perverted the argument into the following form:

"The author, speaking under a mask, uses a bold licence of blasphemy against Nature and its God which too clearly comes from the heart."*

Now the folly of reproaches of this kind may be made especially apparent by our reminding our readers that if they be at all sustainable, a very large part of Butler's *Analogy* lies open to them. We are the more desirous of putting the case upon this issue, because Butler has formally entered upon the defence of this method of inquiry in that chapter of his work entitled, "*Of the Objections which may be made against arguing from the Analogy of Nature to Religion.*" We commend the powerful reasoning of that chapter to the serious attention of all who may wish to see the question set in its true light. The following brief extract alone is, we think, a sufficient vindication of the course of reasoning against which Mr. Newman has manifested such unnecessary and inappropriate indignation.

"Since it is as unreasonable as it is common, to urge objections against revelation, which are of equal weight against natural religion; and those who do this, if they are not confused themselves, deal unfairly with others, in making it seem that they are arguing only against revelation, or particular doctrines of it, when in reality they are arguing against moral providence; it is a thing of consequence to show that such objections are as much levelled against natural religion as against revealed. And objections, which are equally applicable to both, are properly speaking answered, by its being shown that they are so, provided the former be admitted to be true. And without taking in the consideration how distinctly this is admitted, it is plainly very material to observe, that as

* Phases of Faith, 2nd edition, p. 194.

the things objected against in natural religion are of the same kind with what is certain matter of experience in the course of providence, and in the information which God affords us concerning our temporal interest under his government; so the objections against the system of Christianity, and the evidence of it, are of the very same kind with those which are made against the system and evidence of natural religion."*

Γ.

DREAM NOT, BUT WORK!

Dream not, but work! Be bold! be brave!
Let not a coward spirit crave
Escape from tasks allotted!
Thankful for toil and danger be;
Duty's high call will make thee flee
The vicious—the besotted.

Think not thy share of strife too great;
Speed to thy post, erect, elate;
Strength from above is given
To those who combat sin and wrong,
Nor ask how much, nor count how long,
They with the foe have striven!

Wage ceaseless war 'gainst lawless might—
Speak out the truth—act out the right—
Shield the defenceless.
Be firm—be strong—improve the time—
Pity the sinner—but for crime,
Crush it—relentless!

Strive on, strive on, nor ever deem
Thy work complete. Care not to seem,
But be, a Christian true.
Think, speak and act 'gainst mean device;
Wrestle with those who sacrifice
The many to the few.

Forget thyself, but bear in mind
The claims of suffering humankind:
So shall the welcome night,
Unseen, o'ertake thee, and thy soul,
Sinking in slumber at the goal,
Wake in eternal night!

R. A. P.

---

* Butler's Analogy, Part ii. Ch. viii.

ON THE GULISTAN OF SADI.*

A NATIONAL literature is the reflection and embodiment of the moral and intellectual mind of a nation. We see in it not simply those peculiarities which distinguish the individual from the individual, but that tone of thought and feeling which is shared by a whole people, and is exhibited in a marked difference of one nation from another. Every national literature, therefore,—even those which, by comparison with our own, we are disposed to regard as barbarous,—will be a subject of interest to an intelligent and thoughtful mind, inasmuch as it contains the mental history of a larger or smaller portion of the great family of man, and supplies materials for the universal history of the race. National literatures, however, are so numerous and extensive,—many of them inaccessible, or imperfectly so, without a varied and deep knowledge of languages,—that few men engaged in the common occupations of life can be supposed to have leisure for making themselves tolerably acquainted with more than one or two. I presume, then, that no apology is necessary for believing that some account of a remarkable work, belonging to a literature alien from the common studies of the majority of readers, and not very likely to come under their notice, may not to some of them prove uninteresting. I allude to the GULISTAN or ROSE-GARDEN of the Persian poet SADI.

My limits will not allow me in the present paper to enter into any detailed history of the Persian language and literature. It will suffice to observe here, that little or nothing remains of the ancient literature of this renowned people. Its existing literature is almost entirely posterior to the conquest of the country by the Arabians in the eighth century of our era. The conquerors introduced, naturally enough, and forced upon the conquered people, their own religion—the Mohammedan—their laws, and, to a considerable extent, their language. The common people, however, would continue to use their ancient and familiar dialect. Gradually a new language was formed by an amalgamation of the dialect of the conquerors and the conquered,—the conquerors giving to it a great number of their words, particularly abstract terms and those expressive of the sciences, arts, &c.,—the conquered retaining those which expressed the old domestic relations and the old forms of thought—in fact, the idioms and grammar of the ancient language. The change was almost precisely analogous to that by which our own English tongue was formed out of the German dialect of our Saxon forefathers, and the French of their Norman conquerors. The new

* The Gulistan, or Rose-Garden, of Sadi; translated, for the first time, into Prose and Verse. By Edward B. Eastwick, Professor of Oriental Languages in the East-India College, Haileybury. Printed and published by Austin, Hertford. 1852.

language, the modern Persian, has been cultivated with great care by numerous writers in various branches of literature, many of them of very considerable genius; and it is one of the most distinguished amongst them,—the one most universally read and quoted by the oriental world,—whom I now wish to introduce to my readers, availing myself for this purpose of a new and excellent translation of the original by Mr. Eastwick, Professor of Oriental Languages in the East-India College, Haileybury.

This, indeed, is not the first translation to make known the Gulistan of Sadi to the Western world. As early as 1651, a Latin translation was published at Amsterdam by Geo. Gentius, accompanied, I think, by the Persian original, under the title of "Rosarium Politicum." It is so long since I had this book in my hands, that I am unable to say how it is executed. Mr. Eastwick says, "It exhibits, along with the energy, all the roughness of a pioneer." A century and a half elapsed before a translation appeared in our own language. This was edited with the Persian text by Mr. Gladwin, and published at Calcutta in two vols. 4to, in 1806. The text and the translation, in separate volumes, were reprinted at London in 1808 and 1809. Since that period, translations have been made by Dumoulin, Lee and Ross in English, and in French an excellent one by M. Semelet. Of the respective merits of these several works, it is unnecessary to speak here. It is probable that they are little known, and have done little to spread the fame or merits of Sadi, amongst mere English readers. The distinguishing feature of Mr. Eastwick's version is, that it is the only one which has rendered the poetry, with which the original is largely interspersed, into English verse. It is only just to remark, in passing, that, over and above the excellence of the translation, it is got up, to use the technical term, in an elegant Persian style, with oriental embellishments, and does the highest credit to Mr. Austin, of Hertford, from whose press it issued last year.

The reader of a celebrated work naturally desires to know something about the author. I am sorry to say that, in the case of Sadi, little is known to gratify that wish. There is a meagre account of him preserved in a Persian work, the Atish Kadah, and Ross has gleaned a few additional particulars from his works. It appears that his father's name was Abdullah, and that he was descended from Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed, but that he held no higher office than some petty situation under the Diwan. His father died when he was still a child; his mother survived to a later period. He was educated in a college at Baghdad, where he was instructed in science and theology, and in which he held a kind of fellowship. With one of his instructors he made his first pilgrimage to Mecca. These pilgrimages he repeated no less than fourteen times. About the middle of his life, Baghdad was sacked by the Tatar Hulahu, and an immense

number of its inhabitants massacred. It was possibly this event which drove him forth on his travels. Ross mentions Europe, Barbary, Egypt, Palestine, Asia Minor, Arabia, Persia, Tatary and India, as countries which he visited. Kœmfer, who was at Shiraz in 1686, tells us that he had been in Italy, and that to the oriental languages he had superadded Latin, and had diligently studied Seneca. If there be any truth in this, it may account for the highly moral tone of his writings. It appears, from a passage in the Gulistan, that he was taken prisoner by the Crusaders, and forced to work with a gang of Jews in the fosse of Tripolis. His opinion of the Christians was not very favourable, but he speaks with reverence of their Lord; and in the Gulistan we find him engaged in devotion at the tomb of John the Baptist, where he says,

> "The poor, the rich, alike must here adore;
> The wealthier they, their need is still the more."

He was twice married; not apparently very happily, for his notices of the female sex are not very laudatory. Of his first nuptials, he gives an amusing account in the 31st story of the second chapter of the Gulistan. The latter part of his life appears to have been passed in retirement. He died about the year 690 or 691 of the Mohammedan era, or early in the fourteenth century of ours, and was buried near Shiraz, where Kœmfer, in 1686, and Col. Franklin, in 1787, visited his tomb. The latter mentions it as being just in the state it was when Sadi was buried. He left behind him, according to Ross, twenty-two works, of which the most celebrated are the Bostan and the Gulistan. The former, as far as I am aware, has never yet been translated.

Of a work like the Gulistan, it is difficult to convey a very just notion, without extracts too copious for the limits of these pages. It is not a regular treatise; it is not a consecutive narrative; it is not a fable artfully constructed, and pleasing the reader by the interest of its circumstances, or the brilliancy of its imagination, or the force or splendour or beauty of its detached passages. Its characteristic features are its highly religious and moral tone, its practical good sense, and its acute observations on life and manners, delivered in a style remarkable, in a Persian writer, for its perspicuity and simplicity, and the elegance of which has placed the author in the highest rank amongst the classics of his cultivated language. Mr. Eastwick says of it—"The great beauty of Sadi's style is its elegant simplicity. In wit, he is not inferior to Horace, whom he also resembles in his 'curiosa verborum felicitas.'" Such a style can scarcely be preserved in any translation; it can only at the best be imitated by one as closely analogous to it as may be. The work itself is a collection of short stories, or, to describe them more properly—though called stories in the original—of anecdotes rather, drawn very frequently from personal experience, illus-

trated by maxims, proverbs and remarks, and embellished now and then with pretty apologues, sometimes in prose, sometimes in verse, more commonly in a mixture of both. These are distributed into seven chapters, and an eighth consisting entirely of short apothegms on the duties of society. The whole is introduced by a preface, giving an account of the origin and object of the work, on which the author—as is usually the case with the Persians—has lavished in profuse abundance all the ornate suggestions of his imagination, departing a little here from the usual simplicity of his style. It commences with an invocation of the Deity, and nobly sets forth, as the translator observes, "the unity, the unapproachable majesty, the omnipotence, the long-suffering and the goodness of God." I quote a passage or two.

"Every breath which is inhaled prolongs life, and when respired exhilarates the frame. In every breath, therefore, two blessings are contained, and for every blessing a separate thanksgiving is due."—P. 1.

"All-gracious One! who from thy hidden store
On Guebre dost and Pagan alms bestow!
When will thy mercies crown thy friends no more?
Thou who with love regardest e'en thy foe!"

"He biddeth his chamberlain, the morning breeze, spread out the emerald carpet of the earth, and commandeth his nurses, the vernal clouds, to foster in earth's cradle the daughters of the grass, and clotheth the trees with a garment of green leaves, and at the approach of spring crowneth the young branches with wreaths of blossoms; and by his power the juice of the cane becometh exquisite honey, and the date-seed by his nurture a lofty tree.

"Cloud and wind, and sun and sky,
Labour all harmoniously,
That while they thee with food supply,
Thou mayst not eat unthankfully;
Since all are busied and intent for thee,
Justice forbids that thou a rebel be."—Pp. 2, 3.

"God's condescension and his mercy see!
His servant sinneth, and ashamed is He!"—P. 5.

"O loftier than all thought,
Conception, fancy, or surmise!
All vainly thou art sought,
Too high for feeble man's emprise.
Past is our festive day,
And reached at length life's latest span,
Thy dues are yet to pay,
The firstlings of thy praise by man."—P. 7.

Then follows the eulogium of the reigning monarch, in which occurs the following beautiful apologue, illustrative of the advantages of good society:

"'Twas in the bath a piece of perfumed clay
Came from my loved one's hands to mine one day.

'Art thou then musk or ambergris?' I said;
'That by thy scent my soul is ravished?'
'Not so,' it answered; 'worthless earth was I,
But long I kept the Rose's company;
Thus near, its perfect fragrance to me came,
Else I'm but earth—the worthless and the same.'"—P. 9.

Then follows Sadi's account of the cause of his writing the Gulistan. He had taken, it appears, a resolution to withdraw himself from the world and give himself up to religious meditation. "I thought it advisable," says he, "to take my seat in retirement, and gather under me my robe, withdrawing from society, and wash the tablet of my memory from vain words, nor speak idly in future." From this state of mental abstraction and intellectual inactivity one of his friends vainly endeavours to arouse him, till on one occasion he is lured to take some recreation in a beautiful garden. His companion had gathered a lap-full of roses to carry back to the city, when Sadi said, "To the rose of the flower-garden there is, as you know, no continuance; nor is there faith in the promise of the rose-garden: and the sages have said that we should not fix our affections on that which has no endurance. But," added he, "I am able to compose a book, whose leaves the rude hand of the blast of autumn cannot affect, and the blitheness of whose spring the revolution of time cannot change into the disorder of the waning year." His friend, throwing down his roses, exclaimed, "When the generous promise, they perform." The result was, that "whilst the rose of the flower-garden still continued to bloom, the book of the 'Rose-Garden' was finished."

"This verse instructive shall remain, when I,
Scattered in dust, in several atoms lie;
Perhaps hereafter for this pious task,
Some man of prayer for me too grace shall ask."—P. 29.

The work, as I have before said, is divided into Eight Chapters. The first, "On the Manners of Kings," consisting of forty-one stories or anecdotes, contains many wise and beautiful maxims, which many a despot might well profit by, if despots were as willing to listen to good counsel as to the suggestions of their own passions; and which some, we will hope, have listened to and followed. I can only quote a passage or two.

"Full many a chief of glorious name
Beneath the ground now buried lies,
Yet not one token of his fame
On earth's wide surface meets our eyes.

That aged form, of life bereft,
Which to earth's keeping they commit,
The soil devours; no bone is left,
No trace remains to tell of it.

The glorious name of Nushirwân
Lives in his deeds year after year:
Do good, my friend, and look upon
This life as an occasion won
For acting well, ere yet we hear
Of thee that thy career is done."—P. 35.

"All Adam's race are members of one frame,
Since all at first from the same essence came;
When by hard fortune one limb is opprest,
The other members lose their wonted rest:
If thou feel'st not for others' misery,
A son of Adam is no name for thee."—P. 53.

I transcribe, as it is short, the 19th story entire, to shew more completely Sadi's manner and the nature of his work.

"They relate that once, during a hunting expedition, they were preparing for Nushirwân the Just some game as roast meat. There was no salt, and they despatched a slave to a village to bring some. Nushirwân said, 'Pay for the salt you take, in order that it may not become a custom, and the village be ruined.' They said, 'What harm will this little quantity do?' He replied, 'The origin of injustice in the world was at first small, and every one who came added to it, until it reached this magnitude.'

"If but one apple from the peasant's field
The King should eat, his men uproot the tree;
And does the Sultan but his sanction yield
To extort five eggs, his followers will see
Cause with a thousand pullets to make free.
Not always will the wicked tyrant live;
The curse upon him will for aye survive."—P. 71.

Here is another, the 30th story:

"A king gave an order to put an innocent person to death. He said, 'O King! for the anger thou feelest against me, seek not thine own injury.' The king asked, 'How so?' He replied, 'I shall suffer this pang but for a moment, but the guilt of it will attach to thee for ever.'

"Circling on, life's years have fled, as flies the breeze of morn;
Sadness and mirth, and foul and fair, for aye have passed away.
Dream'st thou, tyrant! thou hast wreaked on me thy rage and scorn?
The burden from my neck has passed: on thine, must ever stay."
P. 87.

The 41st story:

"They said to Alexander of Rum, 'How didst thou conquer the Eastern and Western worlds, when former kings surpassed thee in territory and treasures and long life and armies, and yet did not obtain such victories?' He replied, 'By the aid of the Most High God. Whenever I subdued a country, I did not oppress its inhabitants, and I never spoke disparagingly of its kings.'

"Ne'er will be called great amongst the wise,
Who to the truly great their name denies."—P. 99.

From the Second Chapter, "On the Qualities of Dar-

WESHES," consisting of forty-nine stories, we can only quote a portion of the 38th:

"A lawyer said to his father, 'No part of those fascinating speeches of the orators makes an impression on me, for this reason, that I do not see their practice correspond with their preaching.'

While men to leave the world they warn,
Themselves are hoarding pelf and corn.

The father said, 'O, my son! it is not proper to avert one's countenance from the instruction of good advisers, and, whilst seeking an immaculate sage, to remain deprived of the advantages of wisdom.'

"Heed thou well the wise man's warning,
Tho' his acts his words belie;
Heed thou well the words of warning,
Tho' on a wall thou them descry."—P. 143.

And the following:

"Hatim is dead; but to eternity
His lofty name will live renowned for good.
Give alms of what thou hast. The vineyard, see!
Yields more, the more the dresser prunes the wood."—P. 153.

The Third Chapter, "On the EXCELLENCE OF CONTENTMENT," contains twenty-nine stories. I select the following:

"In the annals of Ardshir Babakan, it is related that he asked a physician how much food ought to be eaten daily. He replied, 'A hundred dirhams weight would suffice.' The king replied, 'What strength will this quantity give?' The physician answered, 'This quantity will carry thee, and that which is in excess of it thou must carry.'

"We eat to live, God's praises to repeat;
Thou art persuaded that we live to eat."—P. 158.

"They said to Hatim Täi, 'Hast thou seen or heard of any one in the world more magnanimous than thyself?' He replied, 'Yes! One day I had sacrificed forty camels, and had gone out with the chiefs of the Arabs to a corner of the desert. There I saw a wood-cutter who had collected a bundle of thorns. I said, 'Why dost thou not go to Hatim's entertainment; for the people have assembled at his board?' He replied,

'By their own efforts those who earn their bread,
Need not by Hatim Täis' alms be fed.'

I perceived that in magnanimity and generosity he was my superior."—P. 166.

"I have heard of a wealthy man who was as famous for his parsimony as Hatim Täi for generosity. I have heard that he was voyaging to Egypt. All of a sudden an adverse wind sprang up round the vessel. He raised his hands in prayer, and began to make unavailing lamentations.

"What will it avail the creature to stretch forth his hand in grief?
Raised in prayer to God in peril, but withheld from man's relief.

"Go! with thy silver and thy gold provide
Blessing to men; nor from thyself withhold
Enjoyment due: thus ever shall abide
Thy house,—its bricks of silver and of gold.

"They relate that he had poor relations in Egypt, who were enriched by the residue of his property, and who at his death rent their old garments, and cut out others of silk and stuffs of Damietta.

"I said to his heir,

'Enjoy thy fortune, gentle Sir! for he
Luckless amassed; the enjoyment left to thee.'"—P. 174.

The Fourth Chapter contains fourteen stories "On the Advantages of Taciturnity." I select the following specimens:

"I heard a sage say, 'No one avows his ignorance but the man who, whilst another is speaking and has not finished, commences speaking himself.'

"Each several theme beginning has and end;
Therefore weave not discourse within discourse;
A man of judgment, wit and sense, my friend,
Speaks not until thy words have had their course."—P. 199.

"Some of the servants of Sultan Mahmoud asked Hasan Maimandi, 'What did the Sultan say to thee to-day about a certain affair?' He replied, 'It will not have been concealed from you too.' They answered, 'Thou art the Prime Minister of the State; the Sultan does not think of telling us what he tells thee.' Hasan replied, 'And he does this in the confidence that I will not repeat it. Wherefore, then, do ye ask me?'"—P. 200.

"A man with a harsh voice was reading the Koran in a loud tone. A sage passed by and asked, 'What is thy monthly stipend?' He replied, 'Nothing.' 'Wherefore, then,' asked the sage, 'dost thou give thyself this trouble?' He replied, 'I read for the sake of God.' 'Then,' said the sage, 'for God's sake, read not.'"—P. 204.

Of the Fifth Chapter, eleven stories "On Love and Youth," the reader may take the following specimens:

"Pleasant were the gains of ocean, were there of the waves no fear;
Pleasant with the rose to dwell, were the thorn not lurking there!
Peacock-like I walked exulting in love's garden yesternight;
Snake-like now I writhe in anguish—she no more will glad my sight."
P. 216.

"A gallant youth there was and fair,
Pledged to a maid beyond compare:
They on the sea, as poets tell,
Together in a whirlpool fell.
The boatman came the youth to save,
To snatch him from his watery grave;
But midst those billows of despair,
He cried, 'Leave me! My love is there!
Oh, save but her!' He said, and died;
But with his parting breath he cried,
'Not from that wretch love's story hear,
Who love forgets when peril's near."—P. 220.

From the Sixth Chapter, "On Decrepitude and Old Age," containing eight stories, I must content myself with the following:

"One day, in the ignorance and folly of youth, I raised my voice against my mother. Cut to the heart, she sate down in a corner and said, weeping, 'Perhaps thou hast forgotten thy infancy, that thou treatest me with this rudeness?'

"Well said that aged mother to her son,
Whose giant arm could well a tiger slay,
'Couldst thou remember days long past and gone,
When in my arm a helpless infant lay,
And know thyself that babe—thou wouldst not now
Thus wrong me when I'm old: an athlete thou!'"—P. 229.

The Seventh Chapter, "On the Effect of Education," in nineteen stories, contains many striking observations; but I must confine myself to a few selections.

"A philosopher was advising his children as follows: 'Dear to me as life! acquire knowledge, for there is no reliance to be placed in worldly possessions, either of land or money. You cannot take rank abroad with you, and silver and gold on a journey occasion risk; and either the thief may carry it off at one swoop, or the owner will gradually expend it. But knowledge is an ever-springing fountain, and a source of enduring wealth; and if an accomplished person ceases to be wealthy, it matters not, for knowledge is wealth existing in his mind itself.'

"Learn what thy father knew, if thou wouldst hold
His place; in ten days thou wilt spend his gold."—P. 232.

"A monarch sent his son to school, and placed
A silver tablet round his neck, where traced
In gold appeared—'The fondness of thy sire
Will harm thee more than the schoolmaster's ire.'"—P. 234.

"I have heard of an old doctor, who said to a pupil, 'If the minds of the children of men were as much fixed on the Giver of subsistence as on the subsistence itself, they would rise above the angels.'

"Thou wast by God not then forgotten, when
Thou wast a seed—thy nature in suspense.
He gave thee soul and reason, wisdom, ken,
Beauty and speech, reflection, judgment, sense;
He on thy hand arrayed thy fingers ten,
And thy arms fastened to thy shoulders: whence
Canst thou then think, O thou most weak of men!
He'd be unmindful of thy subsistence?"—P. 238.

"A holy man passed by a wealthy personage, and observed that he had tightly bound one of his slaves, and was engaged in torturing him. He said, 'O son, God has placed in bondage to thee a creature like thyself, and given thee the superiority over him. Thank God, therefore, for his blessings, and do not allow thyself to treat him with such cruelty. Beware, lest to-morrow, in the day of resurrection, this slave be better than thou, and thou carry off disgrace.'

"Thou with ten dirams didst him purchase, true!
Not thine the power from whence his breath he drew.
Soon must thou anger, rule and pride resign:
There is a Lord whose sway surpasses thine."—P. 243.

The Eighth Chapter consists of 106 Maxims or Apothegms. I can only give a very few specimens of many very excellent ones:

"Two men have laboured fruitlessly and exerted themselves to no purpose. One is the man who gained wealth without enjoying it; the other, he who has acquired knowledge, but has failed to practise it."—P. 264.

"A learned man who does not restrain his passions is like a blind man holding a torch: he guides others, but not himself."—P. 264.

"Tell not the secret thou wouldst have continue hidden to any person; for no one will be so careful of thy secret as thyself."—P. 266.

"If every night were a night of power, the night of power would lose its value."—P. 279.

"It is not right to estrange in a moment a friend whom it takes a lifetime to secure.

> "'Tis years before the pebble can put on
> The ruby's nature. Wilt thou on a stone
> In one short moment mar what time has done?"—P. 286.

"They asked an Imam by what means he had attained such a degree of learning. He replied, 'I was not ashamed to ask whatever I did not know."—P. 294.

"A Darwesh said in his prayers, 'O God! have mercy on the wicked, for thou hast already had mercy on the good, in that thou hast created them good.'"—P. 304.

The book thus concludes:

> "I have fulfilled my mission, and have given
> Wholesome advice: my life's endeavour this.
> What tho' men hear not! Messengers of Heaven
> Can but discharge their duty; and it is
> To tell their message—point the way to bliss."

My readers will allow, I think, even from the specimens I have given, that the mission has not been ill fulfilled. They will perceive, I think, that Sadi is no common writer; the Rose-Garden no every-day book. The space assigned to me will not permit me to enter into any detailed observations; indeed, it was hardly my intention, which was simply to bring under the notice of my readers a remarkable work, not otherwise likely to meet the eye of many of them. I have judged that my object would be better accomplished by letting the book speak for itself in tolerably copious extracts, than by critical remarks upon it. I abandon it now, indulging the hope that many of them will be induced to possess themselves of it, or obtain access to it through the medium of the libraries and book societies with which they may be connected. If they will do so, I hesitate not to assure them that they will find in its pages abundant proofs that Sadi, judged not merely by the standard of his own country, but by a much higher one, was a man not only of great good sense, but

of an enlarged and truly liberal mind. Let us take leave of him in his own words:

"Reader, for him who wrote this book ask grace;
And let the scribe *(the translator)* too in thy prayers find place:
Next for thyself whate'er thou wishest pray;
Lastly, a blessing for the owner say.
By aid of the all-gracious King,
This work here
to an end
we bring."

R.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

The secession of Archbishop Whately and two other members from the Board of National Education in Ireland, whatever be its cause or motive, is an untoward event at the present crisis, and calculated to excite serious apprehensions for the future. Regarding it in this light, we have been led to inquire into the circumstances by which it has been occasioned. It is evident that a grave error has been committed somewhere; by the Board, if it has wantonly adopted measures which rendered such a step necessary on the part of the Archbishop and his colleagues; or by the latter, if they have needlessly or factiously withdrawn from a sphere of duty where their services were valuable and their presence conducive to the public interests. The merits of the case cannot be understood without going back to the origin of the Board.

Within the last hundred years, various attempts had been made by the legislature to establish a plan of education which should have the effect of spreading some degree of knowledge and civilization among the Irish people; but all those which were made prior to the institution of the present national system, were lamentable failures. Some were avowedly intended to train up all the children in the different schools in the tenets of the Established Church; others had a directly proselytizing aim, admitting no children but those of Catholic parents, and strenuously inculcating upon them the doctrines of the highest Protestantism. These methods failed, because they only excited the abhorrence of the bulk of the population, including nine-tenths of that class in society for whose use they were intended. Other systems sought the same end by indirect means; requiring that the Scriptures should be read by every pupil "without note or comment,"—that is, without *written* note or comment,—but leaving it open to the teacher (generally a zealous Protestant) to recommend his own opinions by explaining "the sense" of

the Bible to the children under his tuition. To this the priests, and, at their instigation, the parents of Catholic children, set themselves in strenuous opposition; and this plan failed like the rest.

A Commission of Inquiry was then nominated by Lord Liverpool's Government, for the purpose of devising a plan of education for the poor of Ireland, which should hold out a better promise of success. After months spent in the needful investigation, and the examination of a host of witnesses, the Commissioners agreed to recommend the adoption of a system whose fundamental principle should be a *united education in the secular branches of knowledge, and separate education in matters pertaining to religious faith.*

This report was favourably received by Parliament and the Liberal party throughout the country (the intolerant and the illiberal of all churches of course dissenting); but no step was taken for the purpose of carrying its recommendations into practical effect, till the late Earl Grey assumed the reins of Government. One of his first measures was to appoint a Board of Commissioners for National Education in Ireland, to whom was entrusted a parliamentary grant,—at first of moderate extent, but since considerably increased,—and who were instructed to organize and conduct a system of education in conformity with the Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry. At the head of this Commission was placed the Duke of Leinster; and among the members were the Protestant Archbishop Whately, the Roman Catholic Archbishop Murray, the Rev. Dr. Carlisle, a Calvinistic Presbyterian minister, Robert Holmes, Esq., a Unitarian barrister, and a few other members. As it was judged expedient to give to the Commissioners more detailed instructions respecting their duties than it is customary to introduce into the body of royal warrants, a letter was addressed to the Duke of Leinster by the present Earl of Derby, then the Hon. E. G. Stanley, who filled the office of Chief Secretary in the Irish Government, pointing out the duties which the Commissioners were expected to discharge and the principles which they would be required to keep in view. Among the latter, the most prominent and important was that of *united secular education* and *separate religious instruction.*

The Commissioners, however, had scarcely undertaken the active duties of their office, when they thought it expedient to solicit a modification of the principle above set forth. Some of the members persuaded the rest that, although there were points of religious faith upon which it would be quite impossible to carry on any united instruction in mixed schools, there were other points on which the different churches and sects were so nearly agreed, that in reference to them there was no necessity for having recourse to the system of separation. They requested

permission to introduce these portions of religious knowledge into the joint or combined teaching, at which all children in the schools should be required to be present and to take part. They applied to Mr. Stanley for such a modification of his letter, and succeeded in obtaining from Government a new rule, not, indeed, to the full extent that was asked, but to the extent of substituting for the original formula one to the following effect: *separate religious education, but united moral and literary education.*

The Commissioners have always required that religious instruction (by which they seem to understand, instruction in the peculiar tenets of different churches and sects) shall, if given in any school under their care, be given only at an hour previously fixed and notified; that no child shall be required to be present at, or to take part in, any religious instruction to which his parent or guardian may object; and that no child shall be excluded from the moral and secular instruction communicated in any school under their care, on the ground of his refusal to avail himself of the religious instruction therein provided.

Under the name of "*moral*" education, the Commissioners have, from the first, included many things which cannot be so included without a stretch of language. This will be very evident to any person who will read through with attention the series of books which they have published for the use of the schools under their care, and which are intended to be employed in the hours allotted for "moral and literary education."

In the "Second Book of Lessons," there is an abstract of the Old Testament History as far as the destruction of Sodom. Surely this comes under the head of *religious* instruction, the more especially as the compiler has felt himself at liberty to give, here and there, instead of the letter of the text, an explanation or gloss founded upon his own theology. Thus, instead of a "serpent," he tells us that "an *Evil Being, who is called the Devil,* spoke falsely to Eve and said, 'Ye shall not surely die.'" The intercourse of "the sons of God" with "the daughters of men," is explained as the "mixture of the descendants of Seth with those of Cain." This seems a favourite gloss, for it is presented in at least two other books of the series. In the Third Book, there is no attempt at concealing the fact that it is framed with a view to communicate, in part, *religious* instruction; for, in the table of contents, one section is expressly entitled "*Religious and Moral Lessons.*" Among the pieces of poetry with which the volume is interspersed, we have Heber's otherwise beautiful hymn ending with,

> "Till o'er our ransomed nature
> The Lamb for sinners slain,
> Redeemer, King, *Creator,*
> In bliss returns to reign."

In the Fourth Book of Lessons, there is a continuation of the

Scripture History, with typical explications intermixed, or substituted for the text of the Bible; and a chapter on the Christian Salvation, in which the following paragraph is found:

"This salvation implies deliverance from the power of sin. We are *naturally the slaves of this power*. Sin reigns in us *as the descendants of apostate Adam. We cannot throw off its yoke by any virtue or efforts of our own.* And so long as it maintains its ascendancy, we are degraded and polluted and miserable. But provision is made in the gospel for our emancipation. Christ 'gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all our iniquities,' and that sin might 'have no more dominion over us.' And all who believe in him are *made free* to serve that God whose service is the sweetest liberty and the highest honour."—P. 196.

However, to do away with the effect of this, there is, in the Sequel to the Fourth Book, a Lesson by Archbishop Whately, entitled, "Christianity a Religion of Motives;" and a very good lesson it is, according to our view of the matter; *but surely it is a religious one.*

There is thus a considerable sprinkling, not merely of *religion*, but of *theological doctrine*, of a peculiar kind, in these otherwise excellent and truly valuable school-books.

But still more decidedly is this tendency displayed in the books which have occasioned so much uneasiness in the friends and members of the Board during the last ten months. These are (1) "Scripture Lessons," in four parts, two containing extracts from the Old Testament, and two from the New; (2) "Sacred Poetry," adapted to the understanding of children and youth; and (3) "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, being an Appendix to the Fourth Book of Lessons." It cannot be denied that these books are expressly intended to communicate *religious* instruction.

The character of the "Scripture Lessons," as not merely moral but distinctively religious, is apparent on their very face. The plan pursued is to take historical portions of the Bible as a groundwork; these are given in a new and often improved translation, explanations being interwoved, and critical notes appended; and in many cases, passages from the Psalms, Epistles, &c., which the compiler regarded as illustrative of the text, are subjoined to each section of the narrative. In the New Testament the parts employed as a groundwork are the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. In these Lessons there is little that will offend any consistent Protestant; but how the members of a church which withholds the Scriptures from its lay-members (especially from children), and views with suspicion all versions made by persons not of her own communion, and comments composed by Protestant theologians, could feel themselves at liberty to recommend the use of these books in schools under their care, seems to us a great mystery. And the fact we suspect is, that these "Scripture Lessons" never were in general

use in schools managed by Roman Catholics. The Catholic Bishops of the province of Dublin affirm that they were "sometimes, *though rarely*, used by Catholic children;" and we believe that such was the true state of the case.

The little volume of "Sacred Poetry" contains some of the most beautiful and some of the most orthodox pieces imaginable. Such verses as the following occur:

> "Remember all the dying pains
> That my Redeemer felt:
> And let his blood *wash out my stains*,
> And *answer for my guilt!*"—P. 12.
>
> "But vengeance just for ever lies
> On all the rebel race
> "Who *God's eternal Son* despise,
> And scorn his offered grace."—P. 17.
>
> "*All my nature* is unholy,
> Pride and passion dwell within," &c.—P. 27.
>
> "In this, most gracious Father, hear
> Through Christ, thy holy Son, our prayer,
> *Who, with the Holy Ghost and thee,*
> *Doth live and reign eternally.*"—P. 56.

Certainly it ought not to be expected that Unitarian parents should permit hymns and addresses like these to be impressed on the minds of their children.

The "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity" are founded on, and in part identical with, "Easy Lessons on the Christian Evidences," published by Archbishop Whately. The first-mentioned book is printed by the Board as an "Appendix to the Fourth Book of Lessons for the use of Schools:" the latter is or was among the books "not published, but sanctioned, by the Commissioners of Education." We presume the very titles will sufficiently prove that these works belong to the *religious part of education;* how they could, by any men of ordinary discrimination whose attention was directed to the question, be classed among books of merely "moral and literary instruction," it is difficult for us to conceive.

Yet all these works, "the Scripture Lessons," the "Sacred Poetry," and the "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity," were compiled by order of the Board, as works to assist in the "moral and literary" part of education; they were published for the use of the schools; and the Commissioners not only permitted, but sanctioned and encouraged, their use in that portion of each day which was allotted to the united instruction of the children of all classes and denominations. This was unquestionably a departure from the principle recommended by the Commissioners of Education-Inquiry; from the obvious meaning of the rules prescribed by Mr. Stanley both in his first and in his

amended letter; and from the grounds on which the rules and management of the National Schools have often been defended both in Parliament and elsewhere. This we regard as the primary error, the source of all the rest.

But let us not be misunderstood as objecting to the instruction of children on the subjects treated in these books: far otherwise. We wish that instruction of the same general nature, though of superior quality to some of the specimens above given, could be brought home to every mind in the British empire, both of old and young. But we would give it as, what it really is, *religious* instruction; and we certainly would neither attempt to force it upon the reluctant, nor palm it by dexterous management on the unsuspecting. The introduction of these books into the moral and secular part of education, and the mixing up of so much theology with the scientific and literary matter contained in the general Lesson Books of the Board, we cannot but look upon as a blunder, and, if designedly done for the purpose of disarming opposition of any kind, a fraud. And the attention of the Commissioners having been formally called to the subject, we conceive they were called upon to retrace their steps.

But we must not impute to the Commissioners, even when they seem to us to have deserted the straight course, a greater deviation than they actually committed. It should be known that the use of the three specifically religious books mentioned above, never was made imperative in any of the National Schools. On this point nothing can be more explicit than the Rules as they stood when the 17th Report (1850) was printed.

"The Commissioners *do not insist* on the 'Scripture Lessons,' 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity,' or book of 'Sacred Poetry,' being read *in any of the National Schools:* nor do they *allow* them to be read during the time of secular or literary instruction *in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read.* In such cases the Commissioners *prohibit the use of them,* except at the times of *religious* instruction, when the persons giving it *may use these books, or not, as they think proper.*"—*Rule* 8: *Appendix,* p. 44.

The meaning of this appears to us quite plain and simple. (1.) It implies that the Commissioners sanction and *recommend* the use of the three specified books, not only in the hour devoted to religious teaching, but in those allotted to moral and literary training. (2.) It declares that they "do not insist" upon the use of these books, "*in any of the National Schools,*" during either portion of the day. (3.) That they "*do not allow them* to be read during the time of secular or literary instruction, in any school attended by children," *whether few or many,* "whose parents or guardians object to their being so read." Here it may perhaps be said that there is no mention of the time set apart for "*moral* instruction," so that under the given circumstances the books might be used during that interval: but this

is a mere quibble; for, under the Rules, and in point of fact, there is no time allotted for moral teaching different from that assigned for secular or literary instruction; so that exclusion from the latter necessarily involves exclusion from the former. And this is made farther manifest by the last clause of the Rule above given, which provides, (4,) that "in such cases," that is, in the case of schools attended by children whose parents or guardians object to the reading of these books, "the Commissioners *prohibit* the use of them, *except* at the times of *religious* instruction." And lastly, (5,) even then the use of these books is left *optional*. The persons communicating religious instruction may use them or not, as they themselves judge expedient.

It was this rule which prevented many Unitarians who have long been aware of the nature, tendency and intention of the book of "Sacred Poetry," from protesting publicly against its use in the National Schools. In schools under their own management, they were enabled, at once, to exclude it altogether. In schools not under their own management, they had the power of preventing it from being used in any school at which a single Unitarian child attended, except at the hour of separate religious teaching: and no child whose parent objects to the system of religious teaching pursued in any school is required to be present at it, or to take part in it. Under this guarantee, Unitarians felt themselves and the children under their care to be safe; and were unwilling to raise a clamour against a system to whose fundamental principle and leading characteristics they are ardently attached.

But here Archbishop Whately has made a revelation which has astounded us, and which seriously compromises his own character, and that of all his colleagues at the Board. He tells us that although the Commissioners have in their Rules, as repeatedly published, solemnly declared that they "*do not insist* on the 'Scripture Lessons,' 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity,' or book of 'Sacred Poetry,' being read in *any of the National Schools*," they have, nevertheless, insisted on their being read and used in *all* the Model Schools, and all schools of which the Board itself performs the office of Patron! And he *implies*, without explicitly asserting, that even in cases where the parents made objection, the books (which ought in that case to have been prohibited during the hours of moral and literary instruction) were continued (whether in the Model Schools alone or not he does not explicitly state), in defiance of all objection. We sincerely hope that his Grace (to whom we would not at all impute a wilful misstatement) is mistaken both in his assertion and implication. If he is not, and if the Board was cognizant of the fact, we can only say that his Grace and his noble, learned and reverend colleagues have broken faith with the public and the supporters of the National Board, as well as with the chil-

dren attending their schools; for nothing is more evident than that the Board has solemnly and repeatedly disclaimed doing what his Grace affirms and insinuates they have done repeatedly and systematically. We hope our readers will remember that it is not *we*, but the Archbishop of Dublin, who asserts this; which we look upon as a thing so discreditable to himself and to the other members of the Board, that, but for his statement, we should not have thought it could be conceived possible. If this has been actually done, then another fault far more grievous than the first has been committed by the Commissioners of Education.

It would seem from his Grace's statement that orders had been issued (in direct opposition to the 8th Rule of the Board above set forth) to the conductors of all the Model Schools, to enforce the reading of the three theological books so often referred to. But by whom the orders were given,—whether by the Board, or by some individual member or members of the Board, or by some of its officers or subordinates,—we are not informed. Whoever may have given such orders committed, as is manifest from what is above stated, a serious offence and incurred a weighty responsibility. It would appear that for some time,—seemingly a long time,—these orders were complied with; and the Archbishop seems to have persuaded himself that they had gained the force of law. Accordingly, when in the course of last autumn he was informed that some officers of the Board, at the opening of some recently established Model Schools,—apparently Roman Catholic teachers of Roman Catholic children,—had taken it upon them to exclude these books altogether, and that in consequence the three books were not used nor read in those particular schools, his Grace laid a complaint before the Board, calling for censure upon the offending parties. This was the beginning of those discussions which have ended in his withdrawal from a scene of duty where we cannot but acknowledge that his services had been most useful to the country, and to the cause of education in particular; although we have to say with deep regret, that in some points he appears to have misconceived his position and his obligations.

The matter having been brought before the Board, the course to be taken was, in our view of the question, quite clear and simple. The Commissioners should have told the Archbishop that they were bound in honour, conscience and duty, to abide by their published Rules;—that in these Rules they had pledged themselves "not to insist" on the use of the specified books "in any of the National Schools," and therefore could not insist on their being used in this;—that they had promised "not to allow them to be read in the time of secular or literary instruction in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians objected to their being so read," and consequently, if, as

would probably be the case (for here again his Grace's narrative leaves a material point in doubt), such objection was made in these schools, the Commissioners were bound to prohibit these books during the hours of united education;—that, in that case, the books could only, by the Rules of the Board, be permitted to be used during the time of religious instruction;—and that even the persons giving the religious instruction were perfectly free to use the books or not, just as they themselves thought fit. The Board should have stated that *under no circumstances* could they nor would they interfere authoritatively to enforce the reading of books which they had solemnly declared to Parliament and the public they would not enforce.

On the other hand, we cannot look without disapprobation on the conduct of those paid and salaried officers of the Board of whose behaviour the Archbishop complained; because it appears to us to have been underhand and probably corrupt. They were appointed to situations with valuable salaries attached to them, coupled with the performance of certain duties, which the Archbishop intimates (here again he is not explicit) were made known to them officially. These duties they accordingly undertook, and for the discharge of them they were paid. If they found that any of these duties were inconsistent with each other, or with the success of the school in which they were employed, or with their own feelings arising out of their religious convictions, it was clearly incumbent on them to bring the matter under the cognizance of their superiors; to state their difficulties and scruples, and crave relief, which we cannot doubt would have been afforded; or if they had felt themselves *compelled* to deviate from their instructions, their first step afterwards should have been to acquaint the Commissioners unreservedly with the deviation and the reasons of it, and leave it to them to act as they thought proper. Instead of doing so, these subordinate functionaries, as we gather from his Grace's letter, "took it on themselves" to dispense with their instructions, without saying a syllable to the Board on the subject, and continued to draw salaries paid for the discharge of duties which they were habitually and indeed every day violating. This is conduct on which no ingenuous person can look without indignation; and in the present unhappy circumstances of Ireland,—where the duties of citizens and even of public functionaries are but too apt to be represented as antagonistic to *other duties*, or what are called such, and when the latter are so frequently viewed as totally superseding the former, and when, in consequence, there is supposed to be behind the door, or under the table, in many public offices, a power more looked up to than the power which confers the office,—it is particularly important that a strict watch be kept upon the conduct of all persons in public employments, especially those connected with education, with a view to the manner in

which the duties of these employments are discharged. There is, in many minds, no doubt that, if laxity in such matters be overlooked, the public money will, in cases not a few, be applied to promote objects very different indeed from those for which it was voted. We conceive, therefore, that the officers who violated their instructions in this clandestine manner, should have been sharply reprimanded; but at the same time, the instructions themselves should have been promptly and explicitly withdrawn, as contrary to the Rules, illegal, and perhaps, in their origin, not less clandestine than was their infraction.

But these steps the Board did not take. They were afraid to wound the Archbishop and his friends—they were afraid to offend a still more numerous party to whom he was and is obnoxious—they hesitated—they delayed: for a long time they came to no decision; and having thus shewn to the party against which their decision was ultimately to be given, that they dreaded their power, or at all events that they deprecated their hostility, they at last decided against the Archbishop, and in favour of the parties against whom he had lodged his complaint. The only excuse that can be found for this delay, is the reluctance they might naturally feel to lose the co-operation of a colleague so useful and efficient. But this loss was, as we conceive, rather hastened than retarded by the hesitation which was manifested in coming to a decision on the case. A decision, however, was given at last, leaving the use of the three books optional, in conformity with the Rules, and taking no notice of the functionaries who had taken it upon them to act in defiance of their instructions. This tardy decision, and the nature of it, is reported to have given deep offence to Archbishop Whately, the author of one of the three books; but this feeling his Grace earnestly, and we doubt not sincerely, disclaims. He may, however, be actuated by an *unconscious* partiality for the offspring of his own intellect, and have resented too deeply the wrong which he supposed to have been done to it.

We cannot proceed farther without remarking the lamentable want of information under which the Board seems to have laboured as to what was passing in its own schools, under the management of its own officers, and in connection with a system for which it was and is responsible. There is, however, no want of official persons whose duty it is to furnish the most detailed intelligence on all such subjects. It has secretaries, inspectors and sub-inspectors,—persons appointed because they are supposed to be qualified to collect and transmit information as to any abuses which may from time to time creep into the system; and these were actively perambulating the country from north to south with a view to collect the necessary information,—inspecting schools, conversing with local patrons and other friends of the system, and sending in voluminous reports, quarterly, monthly or weekly,

as the case may be; and yet there seems to have been an abuse going on for years, of which the Commissioners received no hint from any of them. It matters nothing here what line of conduct in reference to these three books may be regarded as the abuse. If it was the wish of the Board to abide by its Rules (as we hope it was), then the compulsory enforcement of these books was an abuse; and this the Archbishop of Dublin assures us prevailed in all the Model Schools, except some of recent erection. If the Board, in violation of its published Rules, had given instructions making the use of the three books imperative in all Model Schools, then the non-enforcement of these orders was an act of disobedience which ought to have been immediately reported; but his Grace informs us no such official report was ever sent; and it was only by some other means that he became aware of the insubordination which had been practised.

Again, the instructions which must have been issued, to render the accused parties offenders, as the Archbishop considers them to be, must have been issued by some person in high office. We have no reason to suppose that such instructions were ever formally sanctioned by the Board in its corporate capacity. If they were, it was a grievous fault: but the Archbishop does not assert they were; he conceives that the universal practice of the Model Schools was *authorized;* but he does not say it was ever authorized by any act or vote of the Commissioners of Education as such. Indeed, it is difficult to believe that a body of voluntary Commissioners of high character, and acting only from their desire to carry out a clearly-defined principle, and to spread knowledge throughout the community, by means consistent with that great principle, would deliberately sanction a violation of the principle and of their own plighted word. And if, in the hurry of business, they had been at any time in danger of falling inadvertently into such an error, there are well-paid functionaries, a Resident Commissioner in receipt of advantages equivalent to the salary of a Judge, and two Secretaries with valuable appointments, whose duty it clearly was to call their attention to the law of the case, and prevent the published Rules from being thus set aside, without due deliberation. If, on the other hand, such instructions were issued by any Commissioner, or any number of the Commissioners, without consulting the Board, the individuals so acting were guilty of a high misdemeanour; and the salaried functionaries, who did not report the fact to the Board on the first opportunity, have made themselves accessories after the fact, if not before it. In reasoning thus, we proceed on the grounds of the Archbishop's letter. If we are wrong in the matter of fact, it is his Grace who has misled us. If his statements be true, it is plain that a great deal of the public money is paid for the performance of important and specific duties, which are neglected by those who receive it;

and for this neglect they ought to be called to a strict account, and that very speedily, if it is not intended that rottenness and corruption shall be the rule, instead of being, what we believe they are, the exception.

We now approach another phasis of this very peculiar case. Early in the summer of this year, Paul Cullen, D.D., Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, held a Provincial Synod of his suffragans, at which the religious education of the younger members of their flocks formed one of the subjects of deliberation. The recent agitation on the Nunnery Bill, and the part taken in it by Archbishop Whately, appear to have produced some effect in quickening the apprehension of these dignitaries to the dangers which menaced the faith. In their published *Pastoral Address* they scarcely affect to disguise their desire of giving a slap in the face to their illustrious antagonist, while laying an interdict on the use of works, one of which he had avowedly composed, the other sanctioned and recommended. The following passage shews the feeling of the assembled prelates:

"While instructing and exhorting you to provide for the religious education of your children, we need scarcely admonish you of the obligation you are under of exercising the strictest vigilance over the books which are placed in their hands; all books of an irreligious, immoral and seditious tendency, or calculated in any way to corrupt the heart and mind, are to be carefully avoided. All books to be used in the public schools should be free from every contagion of error, and those which are destined for religious instruction should be approved of by your legitimate pastors. There are two little works which have been sometimes, though rarely, used by Catholic children, which we now wish to see banished from their hands. The first is a little treatise on the *Evidences of Christianity*, composed by a Protestant dignitary who has lately distinguished himself by his unprovoked attack on our conventual institutions, under the hypocritical pretence of protecting personal liberty. We need scarcely say that this treatise, coming from the pen of such an author, is Protestant in its principles and tendencies, and that it is not fit for the instruction of Catholic children in the important question of the truth of their religion. The other work is entitled *Scripture Lessons*. It contains most difficult passages from the New and Old Testament, and there are questions proposed at the end of each chapter which would open the way to the teaching of false doctrines, and which the unlearned and unwary might wrest to their own destruction. This little work appears to have been compiled for the purpose of giving a united religious instruction to Catholic and non-Catholic children in the same class. We reprobate such a project. Doubtless, if the teacher were a Catholic, he would endeavour to give a Catholic interpretation to the texts of Scripture submitted to him, and Catholic answers to the questions proposed; but a Protestant or Presbyterian would act in the same way, and under them a Catholic child would not be safe. Separate religious instruction, as it was laid down by the statesman who first introduced the National system into Ireland, is the only protection for Catholics. It is contrary to the

spirit and practice of our holy Church to sanction united religious instruction, or to sanction any instruction on matters connected with religion given to Catholics by persons who themselves reject the teaching of the Catholic Church. In addition to the catechetical works, Scriptural histories and extracts already within our reach, and with which our schools abound, it will be our care to provide Scriptural lessons that may be safely placed in the hands of our children, which will be adapted to their tender minds, and which will continue to build up their faith, instead of undermining it—to foster their piety, instead of exposing it to perish amid the doubts, difficulties and conflicting errors that are sure to spring from unauthorized interpretation. The injunction we now give you to remove the two little works just mentioned from the hands of your children will be more easily carried into effect, as the rules of the National Board do not at all require the use of them."

Differing as we do very widely from Dr. Cullen and his clergy on the question of the value of the "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity" and the "Scripture Lessons," we cannot but acquiesce in their concluding statement,—the truth of which we have indeed already proved,—that "*the Rules of the National Board do not at all require the use of them.*" The fact being indisputable, the matter should have ended there. The books were now denounced by high authority in the Roman Catholic Church; Catholic parents would, as matter of course, thenceforward object to the use of them by their children; in that case, the Commissioners would "no longer *allow them to be read* during the time of secular or religious instruction in any school attended by such children; their use would then be "prohibited, except at the time of [separate] religious instruction;" and even then they were not to be used if the person giving such instruction disapproved of them, which Catholics would naturally be expected to do. Thus Catholics were already in possession, under the Rules of the Board, of all the safeguard they wanted or claimed; and Protestants were bound by the same Rules not to deprive them of "an advantage" which they had always enjoyed.

But this did not satisfy the ardent minds of the members of the Board of Education. The Protestant and the Catholic Commissioners thought it incumbent on them to array themselves in opposition to each other, and to make the Board-room the arena of conflict;—an unseemly conflict in any case; but more especially unseemly where one party was already satisfied, and the other bound by its own public and repeated acts not to express any dissatisfaction, whatever regret its members might feel. The Archbishop and his friends appear to have taken the initiative in this unseemly warfare. On their part, Baron Greene gave notice of a motion which has the rare merit of opening up a difficult and delicate question already settled in the published Rules, *without, as it seems to us, making the slightest change in the existing regulations!* We cannot understand this proceeding. For

the purpose of introducing a great and necessary reform, or remedying an acknowledged inconvenience, it may be needful at times to disregard the danger arising from intermeddling with difficult and delicate points on which men's feelings are strongly enlisted; but to disturb such questions when already peacefully and properly settled,—to run the risk of irritation, dissension and animosity, for the mere sake of leaving things exactly as they are,—does seem to us one of the most preposterous proceedings ever proposed by a public man. Such, however, as will speedily be seen, was the learned Baron's proposal. His notice was met by a counter notice from Mr. Murphy, the effect of which we shall endeavour to explain; but first, we think it proper to print in full the minutes of the meeting of the Board at which the matter was discussed.

"EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, 17TH JUNE, 1853.

"Commissioners present:—The Right Rev. Dr. Denvir; Very Rev. Dean Meyler; Rev. Dr. Henry, President, Queen's College, Belfast; Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor; Right Hon. Francis Blackburne; Sir. T. N. Redington, K.C.B.; J. J. Murphy, M.C.; James O'Ferrall, Esq.; James Gibson, Esq.; Robert Andrews, Esq.; the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, Resident Commissioner.

"The Secretary reads a letter (3,754) addressed by the Lord Lieutenant to the Resident Commissioner, dated 13th May, intimating the wish of his Excellency to be made acquainted with the decision of the Board on the resolution proposed by Baron Greene.

"The Secretary reads a letter, dated 11th June (4,552), from Baron Greene, stating that he cannot attend the meeting of the Board; but that, after mature consideration of the amendments proposed to the resolution submitted by him, he cannot concur in either of them; and that he continues of opinion that the minute suggested by him would be a proper one.

"The Secretary also reads a letter (4,656) from the Marquis of Kildare, dated 15th June, in which he states, 'I approve of Baron Greene's resolution, and will consent to adopt Master Murphy's first amendment, if it is thought necessary by the majority of the Commissioners.'

"The Secretary then reads Baron Greene's resolution, and the amendments proposed by Master Murphy, as follows:

"'BARON GREENE'S RESOLUTION.

"'The Commissioners do not insist on the 'Scripture Extracts,' 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity,' or 'Book of Sacred Poetry,' being read in any of the National Schools; nor do they allow them to be read as part of the ordinary school business—during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend, in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read by their children. In such case the Commissioners prohibit the use of these books, except at times set apart for the purpose, either before or after the ordinary school business, and under the following conditions:

"'1st. That no child whose parent or guardian objects shall be required, directly or indirectly, to be present at such reading.

"'2d. That in order that no child whose parent or guardian objects may be present at the reading of the books above specified, public notification of the time set apart for such reading shall be inserted, in large letters, in the time-table of the school; that there shall be a sufficient interval between the conclusion of the ordinary school business and the commencement of such reading; and that the teacher shall, immediately before its commencement, announce distinctly to the pupils, that any child whose parent or guardian so desires may then retire.

"'3d. That in every such case there shall be, exclusive of the time set apart for such reading, sufficient time devoted each day to the ordinary school business, in order that those children who do not join in the reading of the books may enjoy ample means of literary instruction in the school-room.'

"'MASTER MURPHY'S AMENDMENTS.

"'1st. That the 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity' be omitted from the foregoing resolution.

"'2d. That the 'Lessons on Christian Evidences' be omitted from the list of 'Books not published but sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education.'

"After some discussion, Master Murphy withdraws his first amendment, and substitutes the following:

"'That the 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity' be omitted from the list of books published by the Board.'

"The Commissioners proceed to consider Master Murphy's two amendments in connection with Baron Greene's resolution.

"The Commissioners determine not to come to a final decision on the whole question, but to ascertain and to record the opinion of each member present with regard to Baron Greene's resolution, and the two amendments thereto, as proposed by Master Murphy.

"Each Commissioner then states his opinion as follows:

"1. In favour of both amendments, should Baron Greene's resolution be passed;—Right Rev. Dr. Denvir; Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor; Sir T. N. Redington, K.C.B.; Very Rev. Dean Meyler; Right Hon. A. Macdonnell; J. J. Murphy, Esq.; James O'Ferrall, Esq.

"2. Against both amendments:—Right Honourable F. Blackburne.

"3. Against the first amendment—*i.e.* against the proposition that the 'Lessons on the Truth of Christianity' be omitted from the list of books published by the Board:—Dr. Henry; James Gibson, Esq; Robert Andrews, Esq.

"4. In favour of amendment No. 2.—*i.e.* for the withdrawal of the 'Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences' from the list of books sanctioned but not published by the Board:—All the Commissioners present, with the exception of the Right Hon. F. Blackburne.

"5. In favour of Baron Greene's resolution:—Right Honourable M. Brady, Lord Chancellor; Right Hon. F. Blackburne; Rev. Dr. Henry; Right Hon. A. Macdonnell; James Gibson, Esq.; James O'Ferrall, Esq.; Robert Andrews, Esq.

"[Of the above seven, one alone, Mr. Blackburne, supported the resolution unconditionally; of the remainder, some supported on condition that one of the books on Christian Evidences—others that both

of the books—should be removed from the list of books published or sanctioned by the Board.]

"6. Against Baron Greene's resolution:—Right Rev. Dr. Denvir; Very Rev. Dean Meyler; Sir. T. N. Redington; J. J. Murphy, Esq.

"[These four opposed the resolution, whether either or both of the books were withdrawn from the list or not.]

"7. In case both the books referred to in the amendments be retained on the list of books which may be used in a National School, all the Commissioners present, with the exception of Mr. Blackburne, are of opinion that no alteration should be made in Rule 8, with regard to the use of 'Scripture Lessons,' as at present worded.

"The following members are absent:—His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, Right Hon. Baron Greene, the Marquis of Kildare, and the Right Hon. Lord Bellew. Lord Bellew did not communicate his opinion.

"Ordered—That Mr. Cross, Secretary, forward to the Lord Lieutenant, and also to the Archbishop of Dublin, a statement of this day's proceedings."

On these proceedings we have to remark, (1) that the business of the meeting appears to have been specially to enable the Resident Commissioner to give an answer to the Lord Lieutenant, who wished to be made acquainted with *the decision of the Board* on the resolutions proposed by Baron Greene. (2.) That the effect of Baron's Greene's resolution (if carried without amendment, including the appended conditions) would have been practically to leave the question as it now stands; the substantive part of the resolution being taken almost in terms from the 8th Rule of the Board which we have already given *in extenso*, and the appended conditions being already in force with reference not merely to these books, but to religious instruction of whatever kind, by virtue of an order appended to the 3rd Rule of the Board: see *Appendix to Seventeenth Report*, Vol. I. pp. 42, 43; or, if it introduced any change, it could have only been to the effect of setting apart, *in addition* to the already existing period of separate instruction in religion, *another period* for separate instruction in the "Scripture Lessons" and "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity,"—a proposition which to any experienced teacher will appear ridiculous, and which we cannot suppose to have been intended. (3.) Master Murphy's first amendment, in its original form, would have done avowedly, as regards the "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity," what Baron Greene's resolution would do practically and in fact. That which was afterwards substituted for it, would have prohibited the Board from *publishing* that little book, or from allowing it to be read in any National School, *in the hours allotted to combined* or *literary teaching*. But it would have left it open to the conductors of schools who approved of this book and desired to use it, to do so during the period of separate religious instruction. The Archbishop is altogether wrong in saying that a proposal was either made or carried for prohibiting this book altogether.

(4.) His second original amendment was unimportant and trifling, except as an expression of dislike to the book and its author. By carrying that amendment, no patron who wished to use the "Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences," would have been prevented from doing so, nor would a copy less have been sold or read in a twelvemonth. It is to be observed, that this book never was furnished to any school except *on special application* from its conductors. (5.) The Commissioners expressly resolved *to come to no final decision,* but to ascertain and record the individual opinion of each member on each proposition thus submitted, which was accordingly done. (6.) But notwithstanding this their express determination *not to come to a final decision,* the record of individual opinions appended to that vote has been accepted, understood and acted upon *as a final decision* by the Lord Lieutenant, the Government, the Archbishop of Dublin, and, strangest of all, by the Board itself! Strange, but true!

And this has led to the secession of the Archbishop of Dublin, one of the original members of the Board,—of the Right Hon. F. Blackburne, long one of the most determined opponents of the National System, but appointed one of its guardians and directors by the Earl of Derby, its founder, in whose administration he served as Lord Chancellor of Ireland,—and of Baron Greene, a man less known, but of whom those who know him speak in high terms as a man of integrity, firmness and moderation. After the most careful survey of the whole case, we cannot think the conduct of the seceding members justified.

We presume that they regarded the Rules of the Board as right, proper and equitable, when they accepted office under them and agreed to carry them into effect. All that the Board has done, if we rightly understand the minute to mean what it says, is to refuse to make a new Rule, or to re-enact an old one; thereby leaving matters precisely as they stood before. If the present state of the case justifies the seceding members, they should have seceded long ago. If they could conscientiously endeavour to diffuse education under the Rules of the Board in times past, there can be no valid reason for their refusal to do so under the very same Rules now.

But if we must believe, with so many learned and clear-headed functionaries, that *a decision has been made* on this question, notwithstanding the *determination of the Board to make none;*—if we are to assume that the opinions of the individual members, though recorded avowedly for their own satisfaction, like a protest in the House of Lords, carry with them the force of a resolution agreeable to the wishes of the majority,—we are bound to inquire what is the nature of the decision thus reached.

There were eleven Commissioners present. The opinion in which any six or more concurred, must be regarded as the opinion of the majority of the Board. On this principle it will be

seen, from the minutes given above, (1) that Baron Greene's resolution is that assented to by the majority, having been supported by seven out of the eleven; and (2) that it has been assented to with the amendments proposed by Mr. Murphy, those propositions also having been supported by seven. In the opinion of the majority, therefore, of the Commissioners, the "Lessons on the Truth of Christianity" *ought* no longer to be published by the Board; the "Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences" *ought* to be withdrawn from the list of books not published, but sanctioned and recommended by the Board; and, thirdly, the reading of the "Scripture Lessons" *ought* to be confined to the period of separate instruction in religion [or to another period of separate instruction in that book specially and exclusively, if such be the real meaning of Baron Greene's proposal; as perhaps it may, notwithstanding the manifest absurdity of such a plan]. We have already shewn that not one of these propositions,—if they have in fact been agreed to as the act of the Board,—makes the slightest difference in the time, subjects or manner of teaching as fixed by the existing Rules. It certainly withdraws the express sanction and recommendation of the Board from the Archbishop's two little books on the Evidences; but those conductors of National Schools who approve of them, will still be privileged to use them in the hours allotted for religious instruction; and the Rules never *required* them to be used by others, or at a different time. Thus, even if we are to believe, contrary to the explicit assertion of the record, that a decision was made, it is a decision which leaves the whole case *practically* where it found it.

The vacancies created by the secession have been filled up by the appointment of the Bishop of Limerick, Mr. Longfield and Mr. Hamilton. We regard these appointments as highly judicious, not only on account of the well-known views and principles of the new Commissioners themselves, but on account of their being members of the Established Church.

It would be folly to disguise the fact, that the secession of Archbishop Whately has alarmed and discouraged many ardent friends to education, sincerely attached to the principles of the National System, who conceived that in his presence they had a guarantee for their efficient maintenance. It is cheering to reflect that the new Commissioners are men of high character, who have given, by the tenor of their previous history, the strongest reason for reliance on their determination to adhere to the same principles of which Archbishop Whately was long looked upon as the most prominent representative. This is a matter of great importance in a country divided, as Ireland is, between the adherents of a Church whose clergy are believed not to desire very anxiously the intellectual culture of their flocks or the expansion of their mental powers, and the votaries

of an opposite faith, which undervalues, if it does not actually reprobate, all intellectual culture unaccompanied by the inculcation of their own "fundamental doctrines." Between these parties, the National System will be subjected to continual inroads, open or concealed; and there is no safety for it but in strict adherence to its own primary principles and rules, or recurrence to them, if in any case, through inadvertence or malversation, they have been allowed to drop into disuse.

P.

OUR CONFLICT WITH AMERICAN SLAVERY.

When the sufferings of Christ were eloquently described to an assembly of warriors, they laid their hands on their swords, swore revenge, and demanded to be led against the infidels. The history of the Crusades gives no encouragement to blind and misdirected zeal; yet if feeling is to find no result in action, it sickens into sentimentality. As we not only *feel concern on account of American slavery*, but are actually in some degree *concerned with it*, it follows that, just in that degree, we have the power to check its encroachments, to resist its tyranny, and finally to aid its overthrow.

We have shewn that our empire is not safe from the profligate ambition of the slave power. As the feudal tyrants destroyed pastures and hamlets to make a wilderness for their field sports, so the despotism whose game is slavery, craves every region for its preserves and hunting-grounds. It has already some 800,000 miles of territory, but declares that it shall die, if not allowed to spread. Rapacity assumes the pretext of self-preservation. Slavery divides the Union into sections, greedy in their rivalry. Many in the South covet the West Indies; many in the North, the Canadas. In the first, slavery would be re-established as soon as possible; in the meanwhile the coloured race would be kidnapped in droves for the Southern market.* The Canadas would nominally continue free, but would be liable to the odious Fugitive Slave Law; the British glory,—that its soil turned the slave into a free man,—would be lost. With unscrupulous politicians it is not the will, but the way, that is wanting. To prevent such a consummation, it seems the duty of our rulers to resist any overt act of injustice or insult, which, unchecked, would invite further aggression.

Our Government has remonstrated at Washington respecting the imprisonment of our coloured seamen. The reply was, that

* In Frederick Douglas's paper for June 17, 1853, is a detailed account of a young Negro who was kidnapped from Jamaica by a Southerner, who pretended that he would take him to California. He was fortunately rescued.

our commercial treaty with the United States provides that there should be free commerce, "subject to the laws of the country;" and with the State laws of South Carolina, the Federal government cannot interfere. On the other hand, South Carolina cannot constitutionally treat with a foreign power. Common sense, therefore, dictates, that the Federal government should say to South Carolina, Make what laws you think proper for your own State; but, as long as we are to protect you from foreign powers, you must take care that your laws do not injure and provoke those powers! The free population of this State is considerably less than that of Liverpool; it is essentially weak from the preponderance of slaves; yet such is its passionate and blustering character in its political capacity (for of the courtesy of individuals there we have had agreeable proof)—evinced both by its Nullification measures, its cry of Disunion, and the atrocities perpetrated when Massachusetts sent Judge Hoare to remonstrate respecting this very law,—that the Foreign Secretary at Washington intimated, that if England persisted in demanding the concession, the only course for the United States would be, to give notice determining the treaty itself. Our Government accordingly is content with instructing our consul at Charleston, S. C., to do his best to persuade the people of that State so to modify their laws, as to enable our captains to keep their coloured seamen on board, subject to any ticket of leave that might be granted by the sheriff; only just at present we have affronted the Carolinians so much, that this privilege can scarcely be hoped for!

The Government at Washington must judge whether it is politic to induce our agents to attempt to influence State Legislatures; in other cases, we think that it would be resented as an infringement of the Union. It does not appear a dignified position for ourselves. There is a growing disposition in our Government to speak smooth things to those who are powerful enough to do harsh things; and, for fear of giving offence, to overlook serious wrongs. This does not arise from Christian forbearance; since if Greece, or some third-rate European power, injures us,—if China chooses to be exclusive,—if the savage hordes of Africa trouble us,—or we wish to spread our territories in India,—we at once assume a bullying position, which shews that prudence, not love, was our motive in other cases. America inherits this temper. It is arrogant when unchecked. An American captain lately rescued from an Austrian vessel an Hungarian subject of Austria who professed American citizenship. What will be thought of us, who tamely permit our own unoffending subjects to be snatched from under our flag into an American prison? Either, that any liberties may be taken with us (or rather *from* us); or that we, in our hearts, share their prejudices of colour.

It is not the amount of the injury directly inflicted that is of

paramount importance, but the principle involved in it. If there is no less remedy, we think that a new treaty should be demanded. When the present one was made, the majority of our coloured fellow-subjects were slaves, and the rest shared their disgrace. Since then, with the largest voluntary sacrifice a nation ever made, we have restored them to their rights; but the work is not complete till other nations shew that they are aware that we have declared them to be free, and will no longer permit them to be treated as slaves. If we are to make any difference between them and our other fellow-subjects, it should be, with English generosity, to shield those most who most need protection. The treaty should not only apply to the case of South Carolina, but to all other States which have laws under which unoffending British coloured persons are liable to maltreatment. We should insist that immunity should be given to all who are guilty of no crime. A treaty founded on this obvious principle might for a time be rejected; but we ought not to depart from a position of such simple justice. Our unflinching adherence to it would strengthen the advocates for freedom. We hate war, as we do slavery; but the time has passed in which manly discussion need imply war. When nations meet as bullies, the first to flinch is the first to be attacked; whilst when they meet as friends, efforts, not after sordid advantage or ambitious aggrandizement, but for the protection of the weak and unoffending, may be so urged as to cement that friendship.

Parliament would never have given freedom to our slaves, had it not been for the pressure from without. Statesmen consult—what seems to them—expediency, and do not represent the popular ardour for liberty. The language of Lord Clarendon, upon Lord Beaumont's motion, deprecating discussion in this country, reminded us much of the timid tone of Northern politicians. The political power of the slaveholders vastly exceeds their real power. With half the population, and less than half the industry and intelligence, of the Free States, they adroitly contrive to hold the reins of government; they take care that their Minister at St. James's shall not be hostile to them; and, unless our Legation at Washington is much on its guard, it will be tempted, in that atmosphere of slavery, to pay dishonourable compliments, and make unworthy concessions, to tyranny. We do not expect, therefore, that our rulers will, of their own accord, make any bold effort for freedom; but good may be done, indirectly, by drawing public attention through the press, and, by means of our representatives, through Parliament, to the hostile and barbarous character of these laws, more fit for wreckers and savages than for a nation that aspires to be the world's emporium.

We proceed to inquire what the English people, as individuals, can do to shake and uproot slavery: and here we have a presenti-

ment that we need the candour of our readers. There are some who are deeply moved by the statements in Uncle Tom's Cabin, and proportionately disappointed by the concluding chapter—"What is to be done?" We offer no patent remedy for this chronic and complicated disease. British Emancipation came almost suddenly; so may American: but which of the agencies now at work is to claim the victory, we cannot predict. The plans eloquently recommended by some, are vehemently denounced by others equally zealous; and, singularly enough, ultra-abolitionists and ultra-slaveholders urge some of the same measures as likely to promote their respective views. The fact that sincere and thoughtful men adopt various methods, indicates a need of this variety. If slavery was maintained by a single motive or false principle, a single true principle might overthrow it; but as its defences are diverse and manifold, so should be its assailants. Let not him who would scale the wall contemn the sappers and miners: even those who seem to fly may decoy the garrison and return to the attack.

The first question is, From whom must emancipation come? Except in the case of war or revolt, it is obvious that it must come from the slaveholders themselves. Our Government may discourage American slavery, but of course cannot repeal it: neither can the Federal government. It rests with the several States. Each must act for itself. Some States, which were Slave States when British colonies, are Free now: in others, there may gradually be a preponderance of voters unconnected with the system and opposed to it; but, for the most part, slaveholders have undisputed sway in the legislatures of Slave States, and will continue to have it, whether the Union is repealed or not. The slave codes will not be blotted out till the majority consent: there is now no *audible* minority even for freedom. Something is done when masters have so much regard for their slaves as fellow-men, as to shew them all the kindness which the law permits; more, when they venture even to break the law in their behalf; more still, when they secure them from the law by manumission, though then the law, in most States, demands their exile. Each case of individual conversion prepares the way for righteous legislation. The problem, then, to be solved is, How are we to change the slaveholders? Shall we threaten them, or coax them, or shame them, or bribe them, or convince them, or persuade them? We are not to think only what it is a relief to *us* to say and do; else a few bursts of hearty indignation would have a very refreshing effect; but what it is best for the *slaves* that we should say and do to their masters.

We stated that every one who knowingly availed himself of the unpaid and extorted labour of the slaves, might be deemed accessory to the system; hence the desire to banish slave produce from our market. Free Trade must not claim this case as within

its province: where a trade is not lawful, it cannot lawfully be called trade—free or otherwise. Those who refuse—let the inconvenience be what it may—to purchase or employ anything stolen or slave-grown, take an honest and honourable position. But, unfortunately, there is this difficulty—we are not starting afresh. Before the national conscience was enlightened, slave produce occupied our market; and the sudden stoppage of American cotton would be a dreadful disaster. "Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum," it may be replied; "it is better that our manufacturers should emigrate, than that the Negroes should remain enslaved." Lancashire, however, will not easily be convinced; and meanwhile what are we individually to do? The practical objection to this movement, which prevents us from joining it, is this: As there is to ordinary customers nothing outwardly to distinguish free-growth from slave-growth, we might continually be wounding our own consciences, and laying snares for those of tradesmen, if we insisted on using nothing but the result of free labour. At the same time, we would neither discourage nor ridicule this attempt at moral purity. The thoughtfulness, perhaps self-denial, which it implies, keeps the heinous nature of slavery before the mind:* and we are glad if an inducement is afforded for the more wide-spread cultivation of what may now be called the necessaries of life, in well-adapted regions in our own free dominions.

The exclusive dealing by which lovers of freedom hope to promote their object, is likewise recommended by lovers of slavery. The Free-labour party would willingly starve the South into justice: some ultra-Southerners are agitating to remove the cotton trade from England, and to stimulate continental manufactures, to cure us of interfering with their institutions! It is then open to question, whether abstinence from American cotton would necessarily benefit the slaves; but we entertain no question that all who use it are indebted to them. We wish that importers, and all who have commercial dealings with the South, would shew that this is a cause which is near their hearts, and would use their influence with their correspondents on the side of freedom. It is the duty of all who are clothed in the cotton of the slaves to clothe them with the mantle of our earnest and persevering sympathy.

We may let our voice be heard for freedom by our literature, which is continually diffused on the other side of the water; by collective addresses to Americans in their collective capacities; by individual intercourse; and by aiding and encouraging American labourers in the righteous cause. Our efforts, to be effectual, must not only be earnest, but intelligent: if we address our-

* Buxton used to ridicule his eldest sister for refusing to eat slave-grown sugar; "but," he adds, "her doing so made me think."—Memoir, p. 127.

selves to a case, we must know the state of it. The lectures of coloured refugees, the sensation caused by the Fugitive Slave Law, and the widely-diffused tales of Slavery, excite and qualify our people to raise a protest in the name of Humanity. But if we proceed to give special advice, or to become partizans of any particular agency, we need considerable knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, the relations of State Governments, and the position of political bodies—knowledge greater than most Englishmen possess of their own affairs.

Whilst we are removing the rod from our schools, it seems still the plan of Providence to school us by the rod. The scourges of monopoly, intemperance and oppression, have had a very remarkable effect in awakening intelligence and educating the masses. As long as slavery is brutalizing men abroad, the lessons from it may humanize us at home. A generous impulse warms even the degraded ragged boy, when he hears of the wrongs of the Negro. They may be made the means of cherishing the convictions of human brotherhood, and setting the claims of freedom on their true basis. With this feeling, we hail popular publications* calculated to inspire good emotions, and to instruct Englishmen, when in communication with Americans, to speak of what they know. We think that an interesting series might be made of cheap and popular tracts relative to British slavery. A generation is rising who know not Wilberforce, Clarkson and Buxton. Some acquaintance with the difficulties which retarded their efforts, might cherish patience and candour; whilst the story of their victories would sustain hope for the ultimate issue. Records of West-Indian slavery would reveal the inherent nature of the vile system; and accounts of the present condition of our islands would suggest what is to be done to substitute the complete blessings of freedom for the baneful legacy of wrong. We have no indiscriminate admiration for Anti-slavery productions; neither the word *Anti-slavery* nor the thing satisfies us. The family of the *Antis* is brave and useful; they have their day; yet Temperance will survive anti-drunkenness, Christianity anti-trinitarianism, Freedom anti-slavery. Perfect freedom cannot be sustained without perfect love and perfect truth. The features of wrong are frightful enough when unmasked, without distorting them or fixing a constant glare upon them. No earthly evil is unmixed. Where no palliatives are acknowledged, and the worst is made of everything, the thoughtful suppose palliatives; and the thoughtless, when they unexpectedly find them, are confounded. Persons who are taught to abhor slavery as the essence of all cruelty, when they meet it combined with kindness, lose their abhorrence. The fairness and humanity of Uncle Tom's

* We have only examined a few of the Leeds series of tracts; but if we may take Mr. Wicksteed's (already commended in these pages) as a specimen, the 500,000 which it is proposed to publish will have a righteous influence.

Cabin, we consider to be of incalculable service. Slaves and slaveholders are there portrayed; some as on a level with their deplorable condition; others above it; all as human beings. Despair at hopeless wrong, and execration of tyrants, give place to the generous, life-giving emotions which are excited by the victories of Christian love and heroism. Even the slaveholder has confessed his enthusiasm whilst reading the escape of the fugitives: his native ardour for freedom was too strong for his feelings of consistency.

We believe that the English addresses on this subject to America have been on the whole useful. In sending them, it is of course desirable to consider the end we have in view. In the compass of a letter, discussion is impracticable, and we are content with communicating an opinion. The fact of our writing shews the importance we attach to it, without resorting to vehemence of language. It is Quixotic to interfere in such a way as to cause increased severity towards the victims. The spirit of love, which we desire to impart, must have its seat within ourselves. The earnest, candid and mild appeals of those who manifest their sincerity by devoted labours for the wretched at home, must surely have a beneficial influence. We may be told that they alienate the South, and provoke hostile feeling towards this country. If their friendship depends on our complacency towards the vice that is ruining them,—if their motto is, "Love me, love my fetters!" we must suffer its loss. We wish to be friends; but must decline to be partners, even sleeping ones, in a fatal business. But who are alienated? The bulk of the population?—the 3,000,000 or only the 300,000? We believe that, even in these, the expression of our best wishes cannot be always provoking their worst.

A special reason for these letters is found in the attempt in America to stifle the discussion of the subject, and to brand it as altogether fanatical and low. The voice of persons of European reputation, animates the disheartened and timid, and cheers even those who have never permitted themselves to be silenced. Those who are not permitted to speak of slavery, may freely talk of the letter of the women of England: answers are better than deadly dumbness. Many a controversialist has been converted, if not by the force of another's arguments, at least by finding the weakness of his own. It is obvious that we should address others in such a way as we should be glad to be ourselves addressed, where the moral sense of America is keener than ours; but we do not recal any topic on which we need foreign aid to loose our tongues.

As to communications between churches, we suppose that the usage of these churches is to be considered. Those who administer discipline, ought not to refuse it here: those who believe in exclusion, have here a fitting opportunity: those who have

faith in denunciation, should not here be silent, or it may justly be thought that they underrate the enormity of the sin. But whilst brambles have no doubt a providential use, and an appropriate place in orthodox hedges, we do not look to gather thorns and thistles from the fair vines and fig-trees of liberal Christianity. Till we accord in the principles of other churches, it is not desirable to copy their example. If we address our fellow-christians as "dear brethren," we must convince them that we feel their dearness and brotherhood, before we accuse them of faults of which they may plead innocent. At meetings where it is usual to pass resolutions on moral questions, we hail suitable resolutions on this subject; but where this is not the case, we cannot recommend an invidious exception for the purpose of attacking a Transatlantic sin. The inquiry comes, What were your proceedings when slavery was in your own dominions? It may be suggested that slavery can be made an exceptional case, since, whilst we differ so much as to reforms at home, we are all agreed here; and yet there has been much angry discussion in England on the mode of dealing with this question. There are some who think their freedom abridged by what appears a tyrannical coercion into the Abolition ranks. Anti-slavery-men, like Chartists, are accused of breaking up meetings that have no direct bearing on their topic. Persons who agree in principle, differ as to form: excellent resolutions are set aside, as out of place: quiet men are goaded by points of order: and instead of that harmonious protest, which a little forbearance might have elicited, there are harsh dissonances; and those who had long worked for the slave, are accused of hostility to him. Proceedings which alienate tried friends of freedom, will hardly convert the upholders of tyranny. Let churches who feel that Americans belong to their household of faith, *speak home* to them, but in the same tone as they adopt to those at home.

Some persons deem themselves usefully employed in ascertaining what public men are unsound on this topic, and branding them with infamy. If any seek popularity by forsaking conscience, it is a fitting retribution that here they should encounter disgrace. But on moral as well as on speculative subjects, consciences differ. We demand perfect toleration on doctrinal questions, not from the unimportance of the doctrine, but from the importance of the toleration: so on moral questions; for questions they still are, though not perhaps to us. Chalmers says (Memoir, IV. p. 433), "My dear sir, some people have a very fine nose for heresy:" they have a perverse pleasure in discerning or fancying the slightest taint of what they abhor, and in driving the best and most enlightened men into the enemy's camp: a Trinitarian, if he has a little candour, is a Socinian; a friend of liberty, who thinks freely, is pro-slavery! It is unwise to hold up to obloquy men whom, if we knew them, we might find to be on the whole far more deserving of our respect and sympathy

than others with whom, on a given subject, we may happen to agree. To be false accusers, is not heavenly; and if we often misjudge those with whom we ought to be acquainted, much more are we liable to misrepresent strangers. We convince them of nothing, except of our censoriousness, and turn into their champions those who should be battling by our side.

It is a more genial mode of manifesting interest, to increase the resources of those who are devoted to the object in America. We honour the feeling which prompts to generous deeds; and our impulse to aid those who are bearing the burden and heat of the day, need not be held back by the belief, that in their advocacy there may be much that we might disapprove. *We* cannot be supposed to enter into details: the feeling which prompts the gift, is to interpret its significance—sympathy for the oppressed, and encouragement to those who would deliver them. Various societies receive help from England, not only in money, but in articles for bazaars,—an outward and visible sign of continued and industrious interest. The chief in importance is the American Anti-slavery Society, at Boston,* whose watchword is, "No union with Slaveholders!" Some of the ultra-slaveholders reciprocate it, "No union with the North!" It may be gathered from our previous observations (C. R., Dec. 1851), that we do not fully agree with them. Some of the objections which they allege against the Free-labour party, on the ground of impracticability and involuntary inconsistency, may be urged against themselves: and though, as Northerners, they might obtain a fairer name by disconnection with the South, we are by no means sure that it would accelerate the freedom of the slaves. Whilst it might be an interference in us to aid them, so far as they seek a political rupture, they have strong claims on us as the most thorough-going assailants of slavery. They have made the South very angry: a large sum is offered for the head of Garrison: and so it is possible that they may have afforded a pretext for tightening the bonds of the slave; yet this tightness may make them more brittle: whilst in the North, their uncompromising stand has been essential to the preservation of the spirit of Liberty.

The Free-soil party employs political machinery to give a practical influence to that abhorrence of slavery which the Garrisonians have cherished. We do not under-estimate the importance of their labours, and hope that they may unflinchingly pursue them; but as foreigners we cannot take part with a political organization.

We have a growing conviction that one of the most practical and unexceptionable modes of aiding the slave is by raising his free kinsman. If the contiguity of slavery impairs liberty, to

* An advertisement in the Inquirer gave the names of those who receive donations for it; among the rest, J. B. Estlin, Esq., Bristol, a generous and indefatigable friend of the slave.

impair slavery we must make liberty more complete. Any improvement in the condition of the free coloured race must tell on their brethren in bonds. Nature abhors a vacuum: a class rises after the class above it, like water after the piston. The North has but little moral weight with the South, whilst it defrauds of their rights those whom it ought to treat with the equality of citizenship, and passes such barbarous laws as those which we have noticed. The argument for slavery grounded on the alleged inferiority of race, will never be practically refuted till the down-trodden are taken by the hand. Some Abolitionists, in their eagerness to "thunder" against the South, have forgotten to diffuse sunshine where it was wanted at home: but it is due to the true-hearted leaders whom we have known, to say, that they not only hate slavery, but love to raise those who have suffered through it. Benevolence is required as well as justice: in fact, nominal equality is not real equality. The slaveholder denies the power of his victim to support himself alone: there are practical refutations of the assertion. And yet it must be allowed, that a man whose faculties have been crippled by slavery, is not in the same position as the freely nurtured. Even if all his rights were granted, he ought to be helped and encouraged to use them; and this is a fact which men of stern, unbending independence are apt to overlook. Much more ought assistance to be rendered whilst these rights are withheld. There are two parties who have a tendency to exaggerate the low condition of the free coloured population,—those who wish to raise it by exciting sympathy, and those who wish to crush it by exciting contempt. "If they are no better off than slaves, why free the slaves? Why not reduce these to slavery?" We believe that they are rapidly improving. An important convention of coloured leaders, lately held at Rochester, N. Y., disclosed many encouraging facts; and whilst they eloquently portrayed the indignities and injustice to which they are still exposed, they shew what has been and may be done, and the spirit necessary for doing it. All the Free States are not like Indiana or Illinois: in some, under certain restrictions, coloured people have votes; and where they have political power, however small, and parties are nearly balanced, they will, if they hold together, find themselves able to secure their remaining rights. We are glad to help those who are helping themselves to rise in the scale of manhood. Several persons send aid to F. Douglass, who first warmed their hearts in this cause, to support his paper, which, like too many philanthropic and religious publications in advance of the age, is not self-supporting.* We are glad to find that Mrs. Stowe, in her Key, gives a prominent place to justice to the oppressed, though nominally free, people of colour, as essential

* Contributions for the Rochester Bazaar, with this and other anti-slavery objects, are received by Mrs. R. L. Carpenter, Euston Place, Birkenhead.

to the deliverance of the slaves: and we believe that she intends to use for their elevation some of the funds which have been entrusted to her stewardship.

Much can be done by individuals in their individual capacity. There are multitudes in the United States who might exercise a commanding political influence, who have friends and relatives in this country with whom they correspond: the number is daily increasing, and may be doubled when our postal arrangements are more economical. Let us convince our Transatlantic friends that there is no topic relating to their country, of which we more desire to hear than the progress of freedom: let them feel that they have our sympathy in all faithful efforts to promote it: and whilst we would not presume to dictate as to the particular mode, let us entreat that they would adopt some mode of removing the deep and dark stain from "the model Republic."

When our friends leave us to settle in the New World, let us point out to them the regions infected with this moral miasma, and sustain them in the resolution to prefer life among freemen, to the humiliating contact of slavery. Whether emigrants or tourists, let us entreat them not to forget their English nurture, —that we are free-born, and with a great sum purchased freedom for others; and that the price which our nation has paid is only a token that each of us is ready to make sacrifices for this great cause. And as no one can breathe English air and be a slave, let Englishmen always carry with them a moral atmosphere of freedom, in which no slavish compliance shall venture to abide, and which shall mark them as the brethren and champions of the oppressed.

When Americans visit us, we do not wish to exclude them from hospitality on account of their sentiments. Genuine hospitality receives strangers to our opinions, as well as to our persons. There is something persuasive in kindness; sometimes, it is alleged, it has proved too persuasive: it has silenced the foe to oppression. Let us try its power on the oppressor. We wish that our Transatlantic visitors should learn among us to appreciate the nobleness of equal rights. If we demand freedom of speech for the advocates of liberty in America, let us not attempt in England to browbeat the advocates of this loathsome institution. That *we* feel it to be loathsome, we are not bound to conceal, when those who run—and even those who rush along by steam—may trace the proofs of its atrocity. As the slaveholder, in his home, does not disguise his adherence to slavery, neither would we, in ours, conceal our resolute attachment to liberty. If he refuses to treat the black man as a white one, it is not for us to pretend that in moral differences black is white. Fortunately, slaveholders are not mere incarnations of slavery; and if we can work on the best parts of their nature, we may render each other mutual benefit.

Coloured visitors may also come among us: these we may cheer, by shewing that we do not blaspheme God by reviling the complexion He has given them. On the whole, we believe that they have no reason to complain of their treatment in this country. They return to their own land with a healthful consciousness of manhood. But there are cases (among others, the treatment of Douglass by the agent of the Cunard line on his return home) which shew that Englishmen who have extensive dealings with America require to be narrowly watched, lest they should compromise their own honour and their country's also.

Notwithstanding the space we have devoted to this topic, we have left very much unsaid; but let our people learn the real condition of the coloured race in America—let their generous impulses be encouraged—and we do not doubt that, in a variety of ways, they will spontaneously help on the cause. There are some who, from the knowledge they have acquired, or from their Transatlantic connections, have a peculiar call to speak and write on it: others are drawn to it by the fascination of glaring wrong; they are weary of forbearing, and must raise their voice against evils so atrocious. It is, however, obvious, that as we are not so much concerned with slavery as the Americans, we are not, *generally*, required to bestow so much attention on it: happily, it is not to us the one engrossing topic. But we are surrounded by sins and miseries of ancient growth and slow cure; to remove these is what our hand findeth to do. The higher the part of our nature overcome by tyranny, the deeper the debasement. When the despot who enslaves is within a man, the slavery is most terrible. The slavery of superstition and vice surrounds us still, and experience shews that hot impatience with it is not efficient to remove it. Those, then, are not to be rejected from the glorious host that assails slavery, who, whilst sympathizing with the oppressed in foreign lands, are most busily occupied in raising our degraded and vicious classes at home. The fire of righteous indignation may, or may not, melt the fetters of the American slave, but certainly it alone cannot give him true liberty. The greatest wisdom is required to consummate, what the most ordinary justice demands. Whoever redeems a brother from the bondage of a darling vice; whoever transforms an outlaw into a peaceful member of society; whoever rouses to industry the indolent pauper, and gives manliness and thrift to the shiftless and degraded; whoever weakens the dominion of any popular prejudice, and with the hand of love raises to their place those who had been cast out of men,—is the true friend of the slave. He shews the desponding that all things are possible to such as believe; and to those who, in another land, would timorously shrink from approaching those who have fallen among thieves, his example, with living persuasiveness, says, Go and do likewise! R. L. C.

INTELLIGENCE.

PROCEEDINGS IN MANCHESTER ON THE OCCASION OF THE REMOVAL OF REV. J. J. TAYLER TO LONDON.

The acceptance by Mr. Tayler of the offices of Principal and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Manchester New College, necessitates his removal from a scene of usefulness in Manchester, which he has filled with distinguished ability and unfaltering zeal for more than thirty-two years. * His removal has occasioned a feeling of profound regret, which, though most keenly felt by the religious society who have been so long his privileged hearers, is by no means confined to them, or those who believe with them, but is shared by many inhabitants of the city of several religious denominations. By the kindness of Mr. Harland, of the *Manchester Guardian*, we are able to give our readers a somewhat fuller report of the several proceedings of Mr. Tayler's friends previous to the farewell services.

The younger members of the Brook-street congregation were the first to offer to Mr. Tayler a token of their affectionate and grateful regard. It consisted of an elegant library chair and table of the value of fifty pounds, and was accompanied by the following letter:

Much-respected dear Sir,—While the senior members of your congregation feel that in your removal from the past scene of your labours, they are losing what they can never hope to replace, the junior members who have been your pupils and catechumens feel that they are under obligations to you which they can never repay. The instructions that you have so kindly, so earnestly, and so unceasingly laboured to give, have in many cases been, under the Divine blessing, the means of stirring into life the latent germs of moral and religious feeling, and it is to be hoped that they have sunk deep into all our hearts, and will ever continue to influence our conduct. Whether we shall prove ourselves worthy of the untiring zeal and energy and kindness that you have shewn, is not for us to say; but one thing we can truly affirm, that even the high respect with which you have inspired us is not surpassed by the affection we feel for you. Most sincerely we regret your departure from amongst us; at the same time we would express a hope that many years of usefulness and happiness are in store for you. As a small testimony of our gratitude, respect and affection, we beg your acceptance of a library table and chair, which we trust may at once contribute to your comfort in your future study, and sometimes remind you of the pupils who have passed so many quiet, happy hours in your present one. In the same heartfelt gratitude and affection, we beg to subscribe ourselves, dear Mr. Tayler, your most sincerely attached pupils.

Mr. Tayler acknowledged the gift in the letter that follows:

My dear Young Friends,—It is some compensation for the extreme pain of such a separation as I have now in prospect, that feelings of regard and attachment, of which I rejoice to be assured that I am in any degree the object, and which on my part, I can truly say, are cordially reciprocated, come forth and find an expression to an extent which I might not otherwise have suspected. There is no consciousness on earth so sweet as that of having contributed, however slightly, to the awakening and strengthening in young minds, of those principles which give to life all its beauty and its worth,—which help us towards a solution of its great spiritual problems,—and tend to right us with ourselves and the overruling providence of God. If you have derived, as I trust you may, any comfort or interest or advantage from such instruction as I have been able to offer you, the benefit has been reciprocal. I have learned much of the highest value from my intercourse, as a teacher, with the earnest and thoughtful young, and from the opportunities which have been thus afforded me of watching the workings of fresh and unperverted natures, when their attention has been first seriously directed to the fundamental conviction and solemn tenets of religion. Some of the happiest hours of my past life have been spent in this employment; and whatever be my success or my failure in the scenes of

* Mr. Tayler was ordained minister of the congregation then worshiping in Mosley Street, Manchester, on Good Friday (April 20) 1821. The introductory prayer was offered by Rev. J. G. Robberds; the address on behalf of the congregation by G. W. Wood, Esq.; the charge by Rev. Charles Wellbeloved; and the sermon by Dr. Hutton. The services were published.

duty to which I shall be shortly summoned, these are memories which can never perish, but will be a comfort and a blessing to my heart to my dying hour. Your future characters, and your progress through the varied trial and discipline of life, will ever be watched by me with the deepest interest and sympathy. Though I am about to remove to a distance, I hope I shall always maintain a constant intercourse with Manchester. You will be much and often in my thoughts; and I do trust that our common remembrances will keep alive in all of us—in you and in me—however different the spheres in which we may be called to act—an unabated effort and earnestness to make the world in which our Heavenly Father has placed us, and furnished us each with respective gifts of usefulness, a better, happier, and more beautiful world. Let me assure you, my very dear friends, that no memorial could be more acceptable to me than the one which you propose. My study table will remind me of you all every day; and so long as I live, and am capable of any exertion in this world, my study table will probably be the last of material objects from which I shall separate myself. That every comfort and blessing of this life may accompany you, and the hope of a life more blessed and glorious still cheer and sustain you when this draws to its close,—and that you and I may live to enjoy many future opportunities of happy intercourse here, and look forward to a happier re-union hereafter, is, I assure you, the sincere and fervent prayer of your affectionate and devoted friend, JOHN JAMES TAYLER.

York Place, Sept. 1, 1853.

The principal testimonial was from the adult members of his flock, and consisted of a large and handsome silver salver (value £60), upon which was placed a bank post bill for £420. 12*s*. The salver bore this inscription:

Presented to the Rev. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A., a parting gift from Members of his Congregation in Manchester, in testimony of their affectionate regard, and their grateful sense of his earnest and faithful devotedness as their Pastor for a period of more than Thirty years.—Upper Brook-street Chapel, Sept. 1853.

This parting gift was, in accordance with Mr. Tayler's wish, presented at his private residence, on Monday, September 19, by a deputation consisting of Messrs. Joseph Ewart, Chapel-warden; Richard Aspden, Treasurer; Leopold Reiss; John Standring; R. D. Darbishire; and J. Harland, Secretary. Mr. Tayler, deeply affected, expressed in the most touching manner his profound sense of the kindness and regard manifested by his congregation, and assured them, through the deputation, that, highly as he valued the gift itself, he prized it much more highly as the exponent and expression of those feelings of friendship and affection which he trusted would know no abatement. Most fervently he reciprocated every good wish, every earnest prayer, by which this gift had been accompanied. The deputation, as soon as their mission was accomplished, withdrew from an interview, in which on both sides the pain of parting was the predominant feeling.

On the evening of that day, the usual half-yearly tea-party of the parents and teachers of the Lower Mosley-street schools was held in the school-room. After tea, the party retired to the Upper school-room, which was festooned for the occasion. Mr. John O. Curtis, superintendent of the school, was called to the chair, and introduced the business by stating, that the object of these meetings was to bring the parents and teachers into contact, being satisfied that much good would result therefrom. Although the Lower Mosley-street schools were not, like most other Sunday-schools, built in connection with a particular congregation, they were supported by the ministers of two congregations in Manchester; and ever since the building was erected, the congregation over which the Rev. John James Tayler presided, had taken a great interest in their work. There were few of their teachers who had not found the benefit of Mr. Tayler's advice and counsel, or experienced the value of the influence of his labours. Many lectures had been delivered by him within the school, and he might be permitted to refer more particularly to one address, delivered in that room some months ago, which had been printed and widely distributed among the families of the scholars. He trusted that that address would continue to be read as it deserved to be: its advice and directions were fitted to be most beneficial to Sunday scholars and their parents. They had only too good reason to regret that they were about to lose the presence and instruction of their long-tried friend, Mr. Tayler.

Mr. John Craven, Secretary of the boys' school, then read the following address:

To the Rev. John James Tayler, B. A.

Rev. and dear Sir,—We have learned with much concern that the connection is about to be dissolved which has so long subsisted between you, as Minister of Upper Brook-street Chapel, and ourselves, the Teachers and Scholars of the Lower Mosley-street Sunday-schools. Whilst deeply regretting that circumstances appear to render the separation necessary, we wish to take this opportunity of expressing our high esteem for your character as a Christian Minister, and our admiration of your unwearied exertions in the cause of human improvement. And we request you to accept from us a trifling memorial of that good feeling and cordial co-operation which has always existed between us. The earnest solicitude which you have manifested on all occasions for the prosperity of the institution, will live in our remembrance. But we are especially reminded of your cheerful readiness to visit the schools and encourage us with the word of exhortation; also the willing aid so often rendered in delivering lectures, and even conducting classes, for the improvement of all who chose to attend.

The beneficial influence of these labours, it may be confidently hoped, will long continue to be felt. Many who are now distant from us have carried with them to other parts of the land and of the world, grateful recollections of your endeavours for their good. And we who remain will strive, with the Divine blessing, to shew that your example and labours amongst us produce their desired effects.

We sincerely hope and devoutly pray that you may long continue to be even more useful in your future labours, and be blessed with prosperity and happiness in every relation of life.

Dear Sir, on behalf of the Teachers and Scholars, we remain, very sincerely yours,

J. O. Curtis, Superintendent.
John Craven, Sec. of Boys' School.
Anne Hall, Sec. of Girls' School.

The address, elegantly written on vellum and handsomely mounted on rollers, was then placed in Mr. Tayler's hands.

Mr. Curtis proceeded to present to Mr. Tayler an elegant writing-desk, for use in his study, assuring him that the motive which prompted the tribute was sincere affection for him, accompanied with earnest hope that he would long live to make use of it.

The Rev. John James Tayler then addressed the meeting. He said he was hardly prepared to speak as he should do on such an occasion, because he had been to a great extent taken by surprise. He was aware that he would receive a farewell address, but he had not prepared himself for such a testimonial of respect as that which had been placed in his hands. He had sufficiently explained in another place, and on another occasion, the reasons which had induced him to accept the situation he was about to fill in another place. But he had not accepted that situation lightly or inconsiderately. He knew how much of tried friendship and of comfort and happiness he sacrificed, and he knew also that there were trials and difficulties and also great exertions to be encountered in accepting it. But they would do him the justice to believe that, in accepting it, he had endeavoured, as far as in him lay, to discharge duties for which he felt he was in some degree qualified, and which he could not discharge under other circumstances. He felt deeply touched by their very kind acknowledgment of such services as he had been able to render in that school. Perhaps it might be considered that he had done no more than his duty in rendering that assistance to the school, and that under any other circumstances he should endeavour to do as he had done. But, nevertheless, it was gratifying to him that they appreciated the services he had been able to render. It might have been thought by many that, in the kind of subject to which he had wished to direct attention in the lectures he had delivered and the classes he had conducted, he had directed attention too exclusively to one subject, viz. the interpretation of the Scriptures. In the interpretation of this venerable book,—the source of a great deal of the most authentic history of the world—the source, also, of all religious knowledge, and of all their consolation as spiritual existences,—he had acted as in the belief that there was no choice between a free interpretation, as many would call it, and the being what many would regard as hypercritical. They were aware that in their own body, as well as in other bodies, there was a strong call for what was known as controversial preaching. They would do him the justice to admit that, while he had not shrunk from dealing with what he felt to be the truth, he could not but see that a large amount of what was known as controversial preaching, was entirely beside

the mark, because the preliminary education and knowledge necessary for the right appreciation of that controversial preaching, was not given to the people. He had done, in his expositions before them, what he could to shew the real object and value, as he believed, of the Scriptures. While he thought that the Christian minister only did his duty who gave his people all the preliminary instruction which enabled them to understand the great controversies which divided Catholic from Protestant, one sect from another, and the believer from the unbeliever, he thought that he was peculiarly bound to exhibit to the people human life, as portrayed in the Scriptures, as one consistent whole,—to shew to the people in humble circumstances that religion and the world were the great things for them to understand, and that the right appreciation of them was the means of contributing to the peace and happiness of society. There were the conclusions of the political economists, in regard to the accumulation and distribution of wealth, at variance with the generally-received doctrines of religious men, as deduced from the lessons of Scripture. Some years ago, he had directed his attention to this matter, and had endeavoured to shew that everything which the economists could prove, was in accordance and consistent with everything which the Christian was called to believe. He thought that the true elevation of the working classes, as of individuals among their number, was to lay before them the great laws which regulate the economy of the world, and to shew them that these were in accordance with all that they were to believe as religious beings; that Christianity sanctioned, recognized the value, and enforced the application of, the principles of economical science. He regretted that an exaggerated language, regarding the forces which regulated the world, was too generally preached from the pulpit, the only effect of which was to make religion appear in antagonism to the world, and to make men range themselves on two sides,—the one of fanatical zeal for its notions of truth, and the other of total neglect and indifference to the claims of religion. What society wanted, was a more manly and a more practical religion; to associate religion more with the business of life, and less with the dreams of a mystical imagination. He desired to unite the spirit of religion, and the spirit of trust and genuine humility, with all that related to the proper performance of the duties which each in the world was called to perform. He thanked them again for the kind manner in which they had accepted what services he had been able to render, and wished them, each in his sphere of usefulness as a teacher, every success in the great work which lay before them. In conversation that day with a gentleman who, in social politics and religious matters, differed widely from himself, they had both agreed in opinion that no community was so full of promise for the future as Manchester. Full as it was of the noblest energy and the most energetic development of character, he certainly believed it to be the most rising city in the British empire. The people might want refinement; there might even be in some measure the tendency to wild turbulence in its population; but at the bottom, it was a community full of good sense and capable of a wisely-directed energy: and if they caused the institutions which had for their object the moral, spiritual and intellectual progress of the people, to keep pace with their physical improvement and commercial development, Manchester would have a great and noble field before it. Without hesitation he could say that he envied the young men of Manchester the work of cultivating in this field, in which in the future they were called to work for the noblest of human objects, working upon men by the discipline of the school and of the church, thereby raising the masses of men from comparative ignorance and want of culture, to a high civilization and a noble spiritual development.—Mr. Tayler sat down amidst loud applause.

The Rev. William Gaskell followed, expressing his regret to be deprived of Mr. Tayler's matured experience, and a hope that he would occasionally return amongst them.—The meeting was also addressed by Professor Eddowes Bowman, Mr. Freeston, home visitor, and Mr. R. Pilcher, one of the teachers. The proceedings, which had been varied by musical pieces sung at intervals by scholars, were closed at ten o'clock with a prayer by the Rev. J. J. Tayler.

The last of these meetings, previous to the farewell services at Brook-street chapel on Sunday, September 25, was a Social Soirée of the congregation, to meet Mr. Tayler, collectively, and to reciprocate those good feelings and wishes, which consecrate the hour of

parting with the valued friend of many years, and was held in the Chorlton-upon-Medlock Town Hall, on Wednesday evening, September 21, at eight o'clock. The room was appropriately decorated for the occasion with various engravings from scriptural and sacred subjects, including The Last Supper, by Leonardo da Vinci; the Christus Consolator, and Christus Judicator, by Ary Scheffer, &c. The room was also tastefully decorated with evergreens and flowers. On three tables were placed a variety of illustrated works. Upon another table were ranged the silver salver presented to Mr. Tayler by members of his congregation, with their reply to his letter of resignation, a neat specimen of caligraphy on vellum, and to which were appended about 200 signatures. Another vellum roll bore the names (without sums) of the contributors to the parting gift. On the table was also placed the handsome library desk presented to Mr. Tayler by the teachers and scholars of the Lower Mosley-street schools. At the lower end of the room a table extended across it, upon which tea and coffee were served, with various cates; and subsequently an abundant supply of the choicest fruit of the season,—peaches, nectarines, apricots, grapes, apples, pears, &c. &c. Seats were ranged along the walls and in other parts of the room, space being left for promenading. The character sought to be given to the meeting was very satisfactorily attained,—namely, a large evening party, such as would be given at a private residence, if it possessed a room large enough to receive two hundred persons. There was no chairman, no speech-making; the members of the congregation being collectively the hosts of Mr. Tayler and his family,—their invited guests. The duration of the meeting was purposely limited to two hours,—the company assembling at eight and retiring at ten o'clock. Previously to the arrival of Mr. Tayler, it was stated by Mr. Ewart, the chapel-warden, that Mark Philips, Esq., and James Heywood, Esq., M. P., had been invited to be present; but that the former could not leave Snitterfield in time, and the latter had gone to Scotland. He had a letter from Mr. Mark Philips, expressing high respect and esteem for Mr. Tayler, and his hope that in his new sphere he might be enabled to assist in educating for the Christian ministry men who might be like himself.—The committee of management received Mr. Tayler and the members of his family in the entrance hall, and conducted them into the room. Tea was then served; the committee and a number of gentlemen acting as stewards. Afterwards the company conversed together, all classes of the congregation being present. Mr. Tayler had thus an opportunity of exchanging a few words with almost every one present, without the solemnity of a pulpit address, or the pain of a formal farewell. The room was well filled, indeed crowded; and the evening as pleasantly spent as possible under the overshadowing regret of the impending separation between a faithful and beloved pastor and an affectionate and attached people.

Shortly before ten o'clock, the Rev. J. J. Tayler intimated a wish to say a few words, and the numerous party having taken seats, he addressed them as follows:—My very kind friends, I think it has been very kindly and properly arranged this evening, that there should be no formal speaking. Anything of that kind would have been exceedingly painful and trying to myself. At the same time, as I have an opportunity on the present occasion of seeing my many and valued friends collected together, I should be sorry for us to separate without just saying a few words. It is quite unnecessary for me to allude to the circumstances which have led me to regard it as my duty to take a situation which involves in it a removal from Manchester; because I have stated what those considerations were with sufficient clearness and amplitude on another occasion. I am very well aware that there are excellent men, and excellent friends of mine, that differ from me and from those who act with me, as to the propriety of that step. That, however, is not a matter for us to consider now: it is practically decided. Whether it be a wise or an unwise step, only the future can determine. I feel that a very considerable, a very heavy responsibility rests upon myself in reference to it; and I can only say that, having undertaken it, I will do in future, as I have endeavoured to do in the past,—my best, to fulfil the responsibilities which devolve upon me. This part of the subject I leave. With regard to other and more personal considerations, I could find much to say in reference to them; but I hardly dare venture to enter at any length upon considerations which must, in many respects, be exceedingly painful and

trying to myself to dwell upon. I leave you to consider what those feelings are towards every one of you; and you must allow me to leave them untouched, in that silence which I really dare not trust myself to break. I can only say that I wish to render to you all, individually and collectively, my best thanks for the long years of kindness and friendship which I have enjoyed amongst you. I would wish to render through you to my brethren in the ministry, both here and in the neighbourhood, my best thanks for the cordiality with which we have all, amidst considerable differences of opinion, continued to act together. I wish to thank the different members of my congregation,—those who are now advanced in life; those who have grown up with myself from youth to maturity, and the young, many of whom I have not only had the privilege of introducing into the Christian church, by a simple and beautiful rite, but many of whom also it has been my happiness—for so I have indeed considered it—to instruct in the principles of that religion which has been our bond of sympathy and union for so many years. There have been peculiar circumstances in my own congregation; it has contained some elements which have distinguished it greatly from any other congregation; and I cannot let this occasion pass without rendering my expression of thanks and respect to those my friends, of other lands as well as of my own, who have joined with us in worship, and who have sympathized with us in many of the most interesting occasions of life. It is not to be expected that those who do not inherit our condition, and who have not been brought up in our principles, should entertain the same kind interest, in reference to all our institutions, with the natives of this country and those who originally belong to this country; but if such friends have derived any advantage from the freer views of religion which the fortunate circumstances of our country have enabled me to teach, they will allow me to say that I have felt, and I have no doubt that my own fellow-countrymen have felt, that it is a privilege to see that the spirit and power of the gospel are not confined to one country; but that wherever there is a human heart and a human understanding, and wherever there are human energies capable of being employed for the service of mankind, there the work of the gospel is capable of being performed, and there the best sympathies of our common nature may be enlisted in its support. You will excuse my alluding to this matter, because it seems to be called for by the peculiar circumstances of my congregation. I will not detain you longer; but will only say in conclusion that I thank you all, individually and collectively, for your long kindness, for your favourable acceptance of my ministry, such as it has been; that I leave you with the most fervent wishes for your health and happiness, both as a congregation, as individuals, and in your families; and that amongst the greatest pleasures and consolations of my future life, in the new scenes of duty to which I may be called, will be that of periodically revisiting you, and of seeing that the few seeds which it has been in my power to scatter amongst you, do not perish in the earth, but grow up and are likely to continue a flourishing field of human virtue and happiness. Once more accept my thanks for your kindness, and my best wishes for your happiness and your well-being.

Almost immediately after the close of this short address,—uttered with deep but suppressed emotion, — the company retired, first individually shaking hands with Mr. and Mrs. Tayler, in place of more formal adieux.

CHESHIRE PRESBYTERIAN ASSOCIATION.

The twenty-fifth meeting of this Society was held on Wednesday, September 21, at Dean Row. This ancient chapel, one of the early fruits of the Nonconformist zeal which burnt so pure and strong in this county, is situated in a pleasing rural district, in a locality which appears at first view very thinly peopled, but is in fact the centre of an increasingly important circle. In old times, as the traditions of the place tell, confirmed by the more ancient tombstones around the chapel, the well-filled place received its attendants from all the surrounding townships, some of the worshipers coming from the distant hills, and thinking nothing of a journey on foot of five or six miles, or on horseback of ten or twelve miles, staying over both services, and then returning to their distant homes. The ancient chapel, though a solid and simply neat structure, had none of the modern appliances for promoting the comfort of worshipers. The roof was unceiled, the benches were

narrow, and rested on the compact clay soil; there was neither stove nor hot air, but there was a warm zeal and a strong faith. The modern congregation at Dean Row is gathered from several distant places, but chiefly from Alderley, a beautiful spot, so well known as the residence, for the greater part of his life, of the late Bishop Stanley. To facilitate their regular attendance, the members of the congregation residing at Alderley have united to purchase a capacious carriage, which, when filled inside and out, holds thirty persons, and is drawn each Sunday morning by three horses. The chapel has recently undergone further alterations and improvements. A good organ has been erected; over the communion-table the Ten Commandments, Lord's Prayer, &c., have been inscribed; and passages of Scripture have been set forth in other parts of the building. A more neat and commodious place of worship is scarcely to be found in any of our country villages, and the arrangements reflect much credit upon the taste and liberality of Rev. John Colston and his congregation. On this occasion, the day being fine, visitors attended from many parts of the county, viz. Chester, Knutsford, Nantwich, Altringham, Hale, Sale, Dukinfield, Hyde, Stockport, Macclesfield, Styal, Alderley, Wilmslow, &c. The ministers present belonging to the county were, Revds. J. Colston, C. Wallace, James Malcolm, James Bayley, J. Wright, C. Beard, T. Bowring, H. Green and R. B. Aspland; and as visitors, Revds. Rees Lloyd, of Belper, and James Taylor, of Dob Lane. Prayers were read by Rev. Charles Wallace, and an ingenious and very able sermon was preached by Rev. James Malcolm, of Chester, from Galations vi. 9.—The meeting for business was formed at the close of the service, the chair being taken by Rev. John Colston. The minutes of the last general meeting and of the subsequent committee meetings were read by the Secretary, and reminded the assembled friends that, in addition to the loss by death of Rev. John Kentish, there had been two bereavements in the county,—Mr. Hornblower, of Nantwich, and Mr. Fillingham, of Congleton,—both of whom had taken a part in the proceedings of the last meeting. It appeared also that the committee had devoted their attention to the circular letter of Rev. John Kenrick respecting the observance of the Lord's Supper, and recorded their warm approval of the valuable practical suggestions offered by him to ministers and congregations on this subject. The services of the preacher and supporter were acknowledged by a cordial vote of thanks.

Rev. Charles Beard called attention to the recent interesting proceedings of Rev. William Forster. He said, that in some quarters surprise had been expressed that it had been thought necessary to take notice so publicly and frequently of Mr. Forster's secession from the Independent connection, and of the establishment by him of a Free Christian Church. It was true that the Unitarians were not a sect who either directed their chief efforts to make proselytes, or indulged in much self-laudation when they were made; they could not afford to base the truth of their views on their acceptability among men, and were certainly not inclined to found an argument for them on the conversion of any one individual. But there was a great peculiarity to be remarked in the present state of all so-called orthodox churches. Their members were every day more widely deviating from the strict letter of their creeds. The creed which a man professed was no longer sufficient evidence of his theological views; and the denomination of a church afforded hardly any criterion of the doctrine which might be heard from its pulpit. Now this freedom of theological speculation was inconsistent—if not something worse—in members of a communion established upon a definite doctrinal basis. Such persons were placed in the dilemma of sacrificing either their freedom of thought or their religious honesty. This was especially the case in the Church of England. There were many of that Church's most distinguished theologians, whose distinction was based upon the freedom with which they treated her most precise declarations of Christian doctrine. And when these men had modified and explained away the dogmas they were sworn to believe and defend in their literal integrity, we were astonished at their happy audacity, and they were held up as models of ecclesiastical liberality. Of a leading member of this school, the late lamented Dr. Arnold, it had often been said, that he was too liberal to be a Bishop: had his theological integrity been equal to his liberality, he would have been too honest to be a Churchman at all. The venerable house of prayer in which the Association was

then assembled was a yet existing testimony to the fact, that other and purer notions of theological honesty had once prevailed; and it was because he believed that such honesty was especially necessary to the Christian minister, and that a paltering with conscience in this matter could end only in a proportionate injury to the whole moral nature, that he cordially moved the vote of sympathy with Mr. Forster, who had set so admirable an example to the so-called liberal members of the Independent ministry, and had obeyed the dictates of his conscience at so great a sacrifice to himself.

"That the members of this Association feel a deep interest in the important religious movement recently originated in the neighbourhood of London by Rev. William Forster, and desire publicly to record their admiration of his upright and courageous obedience to the dictates of conscience, and their sympathy with him in his desire to form a church of free Christian worshipers, who regard the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith and guide of life—who practise free inquiry—and who, while they discard all human authority in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, yet recognize the importance of forming individually definite religious convictions, and who propose to combine with the exercise of their Christian freedom, catholic charity towards all the sincere disciples of JesusChrist."

Rev. R. B. Aspland, in seconding the resolution, which was passed unanimously, read some interesting extracts from a letter recently received by him from Mr. Forster, and stated several facts illustrative of the religious honour of Mr. Forster, and his disinterested and courageous assertion of what he believed to be scripture truth.

Rev. Charles Wallace proceeded in very affecting terms to refer to the recent decease of Rev. William Fillingham, of Congleton, and having paid a forcible and just tribute to his modest worth, good sense and kindly feeling, proposed this resolution:—"That this meeting is desirous of expressing its regret at the death of one of its oldest members, the Rev. William Fillingham, and of recording its respect for his character, as that of a humble and faithful minister of Christ, who for thirty-nine years discharged the duties of the pastoral office at Congleton, with the affection of his congregation and the esteem of his brother ministers."

The resolution was seconded by Rev. John Wright, of Macclesfield, who had on the Sunday evening previous paid a tribute, from the pulpit at Congleton, to the memory of his neighbour, and who had heard from the lips of the clergyman who officiated at the funeral, and from other inhabitants of Congleton, gratifying expressions of respect and esteem for his deceased friend. Mr. Wright exhorted the ministers present to give the aid of their counsel and encouragement, and occasionally of their pulpit services, to the Congleton congregation, who would find it a very difficult matter to secure the services of a successor to Mr. Fillingham.—The resolution was passed by the meeting with expressions of deep sympathy.

Joseph Barrett, Esq., said that he and several friends with him had attended the meeting to ask for counsel and aid in respect to the little chapel at Cross Street, near Stretford. The building had fallen, through age and neglect, into a bad state of repair. But owing to the settlement in the neighbourhood of several Unitarian families, increased importance belonged to the place, and an effort had been made by their valued friend, now about to leave them for the College in London, Professor Vance Smith, for obtaining the necessary funds. By their own and others' subscriptions, the chapel had been put into repair, and was nearly ready for re-opening. About £30 remained to be supplied to the repair fund. They trusted, when this debt was paid, they should be able to secure the services of a minister for at least one part of each Sunday.

The Chairman and other ministers present expressed much approbation of the past proceedings of the friends at Cross Street, and advised them to have a public opening on a week-day in the course of the present autumn, and to ask the assistance on that occasion of their Unitarian friends in both counties. This course it was understood they were prepared to adopt.—The business closed with a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Colston and his flock for the kind welcome they had given the Cheshire Association to their ancient and pleasant house of prayer.

About thirty-five gentlemen sat down in the afternoon to dinner at the Old George inn, Wilmslow, under the presidency of Samuel Robinson, Esq., the Vice-chair being filled by Rev. John Colston. A spirited and delightful afternoon was passed in the interchange

of kindly sentiments and the discussion of topics bearing on the promotion of Christian truth, charity and righteousness.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society took place on Wednesday, September 14, at Newbury, Berks. In the morning, Mr. Howse, of Frenchay, read the Scriptures and gave out the hymns; the Rev. E. Kell offered the general prayer; and the Rev. H. Hawkes preached an effective and appropriate discourse on the apostles' discipleship contrasted with our own. In the evening, the Rev. J. E. Fletcher, of Coseley, conducted the devotional services, and the Rev. E. Kell preached, earnestly and affectionately urging, that to seek the truth of God and to diffuse it with the ardent zeal and devoted love of the Saviour, was the imperative duty of Christians. With the desire of preparing for the services of the anniversary, the Rev. J. E. Fletcher had preached, at the request of the congregation, on the preceding Sunday; in the morning, on "Unitarians the Ministers of Christ and Stewards of the Mysteries of God," and in the evening, on "Unitarianism proved by universally-admitted Scriptural Facts:" and on the Tuesday evening, the Rev. H. Hawkes delivered a lecture, from John x. 30, on "Christ one with God." The services were throughout well attended. After the morning service on the Wednesday, the Rev. Robert Harris was called to the chair, and the report of the Society was read by the Rev. E. Kell. Besides the ordinary subjects of the report, allusion was made to the suggestion of the Rev. John Kenrick on the observance of the Lord's Supper, and to the decease of a much-esteemed member of their body in the district, the late Admiral Gifford. The following resolutions were unanimously passed:

Moved by the Rev. H. Hawkes, seconded by Mr. Squier—"That this meeting, feeling deeply that the importance of a more general observance of our Saviour's request, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' requires *that* attention which has been drawn to the subject by the Rev. John Kenrick, would earnestly recommend a more regular and devout attendance at the Lord's Supper, as calculated to promote our love and imitation of our revered Master, and affectionate obedience to his commands."

It was moved by Mr. Howse, seconded by Mr. Kimber—"That this meeting, duly sensible of the obstacles to the progress of Unitarianism, congratulate its supporters on the advances it has made since the formation of the Southern Unitarian Society, as furnishing unanswerable reason for continued exertion in the holy cause."

It was moved by the Rev. E. Kell, seconded by Mr. Burgess, of Southampton—"That this meeting, bearing in mind the valuable publications of the late Admiral Gifford, of Jersey, in behalf of our religious opinions, the large pecuniary efforts made by him in promoting them, and the admirable manner in which he adorned his religious belief by an exemplary practice, record their high sense of his abilities, his unflinching integrity, his ardent zeal and Christian benevolence, and desire to offer to his sorrowing Sister their sincere sympathy under her severe bereavement."

Between the religious services, about thirty members and friends of the Society dined together at the White Hart, Mr. Kimber in the chair; and the meeting was addressed on various topics connected with the progress of our pure and holy faith, and the support of truth and righteousness, by the gentlemen already mentioned. An excellent tone of harmony, piety and zeal, characterized the proceedings of the day. Though Newbury has always been regarded as included in the district of the Southern Unitarian Society, this was the first occasion of a meeting of the Society in that place; and a strong desire was expressed by the members of the congregation that the visit should be repeated. We are happy to record that some additional members were there added to the Society.

OBITUARY.

Aug. 15, at Brighton, aged 37, the Rev. Frederick William Robertson, Perpetual Curate of the proprietary Trinity Chapel in that town; and on Monday, the 23rd, his body was interred in the extra-mural cemetery of Brighton, with accompaniments exhibiting a degree of public esteem and affection rarely beheld, and extending beyond the members of the Establishment. Among a numerous body of parochial clergymen who followed in procession, were Mr. Goultry, of the Congregational chapel, and Mr. Ross, minister of the recently-formed congregation who had followed their pastor on his expulsion from the Scottish Presbyterian Church at Brighton for heresy. There was, besides the Committees of the Brighton Athenæum, Mechanics' Institute, and other secular bodies, a cortege of 1500 men, walking three abreast, and forming a train nearly half a mile in length, manifesting signs of personal grief seldom witnessed in bodies so numerous. The incidents of this gentleman's life were of an ordinary kind. He was born in London in 1816, and was the son of a Captain of the Artillery, and his grandfather and two younger brothers were all military men. His only early taste, as well as his personal habits and accomplishments, were such as are generally cultivated in the English officer. He had great bodily strength and activity, was of ardent temperament and high spirits, was an excellent rider and a fine shot, and having been placed, by the desire of King William IV., on the Commander-in-chief's list, his destiny in life seemed fixed. But in the mean while he had received religious impressions, and from his boyish days had been distinguished by a moral purity and strictness generally thought inconsistent with the free habits of the camp or garrison; and yet, when on one occasion this was pointed out to him by a near relation, he said, with the frankness of youth, that he hoped to be the *Cornelius* of his regiment. He had received the rudiments of his education at the Grammar-school in Beverley (Yorkshire), and after spending some time on the continent with his parents, was placed in the new Academy in Edinburgh, where, remaining a year only in the Academy, he pursued his studies under the now Bishop of Edinburgh (Terrot), who was his private tutor. It was after this period that the conflict arose in his mind between a military and a clerical life. The present Bishop of Cashel was among those who recommended the adoption of that course which he actually took; and it was considered by his father as a sort of intimation of the will of Providence, that four days after he had been matriculated in Brazenose College, Oxford, official notice was received that he could be appointed to the second regiment of Dragoon Guards. But the die was cast. This only has been yet made known concerning his college life, that when he took his degree he declined going up for honours,—that on the first examination, the examiners urged him to change his resolution, but he persisting in that refusal, they placed him in the third class. He was ordained by Sumner, Bishop of Winchester, immediately after he had left college, and performed the duties of a curate in that city for a single year; but his health already began to decline, and he endeavoured to recruit his strength by a pedestrian tour in the Tyrol, &c. While on this continental journey, he married at Geneva a daughter of Sir George Denys, Bart.; and on his return to England, became curate to Mr. Boyd, the incumbent of Christchurch, Cheltenham, where his family then resided. Here he remained four years, and at once acquired that reputation for eloquence, as well as powers of original thinking and illustration, which increased with his years.

We have noticed his early military taste, but this did not accompany him in his change of profession. On the contrary, he would not readily have distinguished himself in the church militant. The polemics of religion he abhorred as he did the unjust wars of ambition. Had his life been prolonged, and those spiritual or ecclesiastical conflicts arisen which now seem imminent, it would have been his ambition to take the lead as a reconciler and conciliator; and this it will appear was in fact the bent of his mind, though untimely stopped in his career.

An enemy to all excess, he was displeased by the violence of Mr. Close, the Evangelical minister at Cheltenham, and therefore underwent the imputation of being High-church, or, in the *soubriquet* of the day, a *Puseyite*. Conscious of his powers and to what especial objects they might most profitably be directed, he looked out for one of those district or proprietary chapels in a populous neighbourhood, which, without giving to the incumbent absolute freedom,—which he was enough of a Churchman not to desire,—yet left him some portion of liberty, of which a curate is altogether deprived. That, indeed, is inevitably a state of subjection and obedience to be tolerated only

for a time by a man conscious of power, as part of the process of education.

One incident we wish to relate which occurred to him before he became acquainted with Brighton. An incumbency was offered him in the diocese of ——. [We will err, if we do err, on the safe side, by omitting the name, though the transaction does honour to both parties.] At that time, the question concerning Baptismal Regeneration was the one on which the two parties in the Church took their stand. He was himself inclined to the view taken by Gorham and the Low-church, and he had reason to suppose that the Bishop inclined to the High-church, solution of the enigma. He therefore requested the Bishop to peruse a short tract stating his own view, intimating that, as on the one hand he could not surrender his own conviction to the judgment of his ecclesiastical superior, so he would not voluntarily place himself under his Lordship, and maintain opinions which his diocesan disapproved of, even though the Bishop might not attempt to interfere with him in the conscientious exercise of his own judgment. The Bishop replied, that Mr. R. had justly supposed that he did not concur with him in opinion on that much-controverted question, but that the very manner in which he had stated the difficulty to him, satisfied him that he could have nothing to apprehend from that sort of difference of opinion; he should therefore, with a full knowledge of this fact, be desirous of his services, &c.

Ultimately, Mr. Robertson contracted for the Perpetual Curacy of the Trinity Chapel. To use an ignoble word, he *farmed* it,—a word which exposes the peccant point in this modern ingredient of the complex Church system. It becomes us merely to remark, that however the proprietors of these chapels, often builders, may avail themselves of the agency of a popular preacher to render their speculation profitable, Mr. R. was not the man to turn his talents to such an account, and yet he could not fill a station of so great responsibility on terms which did not permit him to exercise his talents freely. Once inducted, he was understood to be independent of the vicar. But Mr. Robertson experienced a sad exception in the single point of the appointment of an ordinary curate in the case of illness. This became a source of great suffering to him in the refusal of the vicar to sanction his choice, and aggravated the fatal disease under which he sank. This has been the subject of a local controversy, on which it would not become us to enlarge.

Mr. Robertson delivered his first sermon in August, 1847, which excited general attention, and obtained for him an immediate popularity. Its effect, as well as the impression made by his preaching, was heightened by the contrast it afforded to that of his predecessor, a clergyman of great personal worth and much respected, but belonging to the High-church party,—one of those uncompromising men who deemed it a point of conscience to assert in the pulpit, in terms, that "the Creator of the world died on the cross," unaware, perhaps, that such language might have subjected him to the imputation of being a *Patri-passionist*. Yet it must be owned that such an expression is, like the Romish epithet, Mother of God, for the Virgin, a violation of good taste, rather than illogical, according to the orthodox creed. Equally conscientious, Mr. Robertson was desirous of removing stumbling-blocks, rather than ambitious of raising them in the way of scrupulous persons. And this more considerate tone is better adapted to the spirit of the age. Proprietary chapels are chiefly supported by pew-rates; and during the whole period of Mr. R.'s ministry, every vacancy was instantly filled, and a right of pre-emption anxiously claimed.

Were the merits which obtained this public favour spurious or genuine? This will be asked by many at a distance who know of what various quality are the sermons of popular preachers. As far as this question has a reference to the talent of the preacher, the means will probably be soon supplied of answering the question, by the publication of some of his written discourses, which is already announced. During his life he had rather eschewed the character of an author; and what he did print was certainly not of a theological, and more of a literary than a religious character. He was fully aware of the difference between a book and a printed lecture or speech. He delivered and published Two Addresses to the Young Men of the Working Classes, which, as well as Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes, were deservedly admired. He delivered an excellent Lecture on Wordsworth, of which an elaborate report appeared in the Brighton papers. Disclaiming the literary character, which he did unaffectedly, what opinion should we advance of him as a preacher? Not to change our style, though the singular pronoun would here be more becoming, we venture to say that what distinguished him among celebrated preachers was the combination of excellences not absolutely incompatible, but very rarely found united.

In the first place, his discourses were eminently scriptural. He delighted in

and made free and copious use of scripture language. His treatment of the historical books of the Old Testament was unique, giving a significance and an interpretation to the events; and drawing parallels between them and the characters in them, and the occurrences and persons of modern times, which excited a general interest, but sometimes gave offence. The novelty of this class of his sermons, as well as of other discourses more directly doctrinal, might well be puzzling to that large class of church-goers who expected and desired only to be confirmed in preconceived opinions; not to be called upon to perform the disagreeable labour of inquiring on what those opinions rested, and whether they were warranted in the conclusions which they had formed. On one occasion, we understand, a discourse on the history of one of the Kings was complained of to the Bishop, and the preacher was required to send it. He was able to send a copy, which, though not reduced to writing until after the application was made, yet relieved him from the desired censure of his diocesan, and yet was not complained of as incorrect. Mr. Robertson, until his illness was become serious, did not write either of his sermons preached on the same day. At length he yielded to the remonstrances of his friends, who were aware of the excessive labour required by the double service.

But with so much to excite curiosity and a purely intellectual interest, there was at the same time an earnest, affectionate tone, that which was in the last age generated in the Anglican Church by the Methodists, who were expelled the Church for their excess, and, when they set up for themselves as unwilling and protesting Dissenters, was adopted by the modern Evangelicals.

Brighton, when Mr. Robertson appeared there, possessed but one preacher of that class,—Mr. Sortaine, of the Church of Lady Huntingdon's community, of an extensive and deserved popularity for his eloquence. Among the pious members of the Evangelical party in the Church and the orthodox Dissenters, Mr. Robertson could not but receive a portion of favour. This he at once obtained by the assiduity with which he discharged the pastoral functions of his office. He formed catechetical classes for young people of both sexes, and became the chaplain to the diocesan institution for training schoolmistresses. These pious labours (so severe as to affect his health and hasten his early death) might not alone have protected him against the imputation to which he was otherwise exposed, of holding unsound doctrine, had he not been willing to make use of all the received language of the Church. So far was he from shunning the creeds, that, unlike those liberal Bishops, Tillotson and others, who wished the Church well rid of the Athanasian Creed, Mr. R. was known to declare to his personal friends that he felt no reluctance to the recital of it, and should not have objected to its being rendered a part of the compulsory weekly service, instead of its quarterly repetition being enforced by a legal penalty.

At the same time, and this alone renders what has been already said worthy of being recorded, is, that with this free use of what those out of the Church consider as the most perilous and objectionable of dogmatic terms, none of which, being the language of Scripture, he would cast aside, yet he would at the same time give his own earnest, bold and free interpretation of their meaning, which, though it could not fail to expose him to a two-fold imputation, at the same time rendered him acceptable alike to the numerous body of uninquiring, because undoubting, simple-hearted, pious believers, and that other less numerous class of modern "noble Bereans" to whom his discourses afforded ample materials for the exercise of that peculiar quality on which the apostle has conferred the merited praise. Mr. Robertson never failed, and we have no doubt with perfect truthfulness, to assert the doctrines, *as he understood them*, of the Holy Trinity, Original Sin, the Atonement, the Sacraments, &c. The means have not yet been supplied to us of attempting to judge with what wisdom, consistency or critical propriety, this was done. A small portion only, we fear, of his habitual hearers could do this. We are concerned here with the statement of our undoubting conviction of his personal integrity. He had to pay the penalty of such conduct, and he was content to do so. One anecdote current among the gossips of Brighton had, we happen to know, more of truth in it than such anecdotes usually have; and it may serve to account for, not excuse, these imputations. Making a slight change in the epithet, a sentence from one of his sermons might be adopted as a motto:

"To the *priestly mind*, candour seems the first step towards unbelief."

A lady of station and influence in his congregation visiting him, availed herself of his absence to gratify her womanly curiosity by peeping into a book on his table. "I am sorry, Sir, to see," she said, on his return, "you are reading a

book of Dr. Channing's" [it might be his Life]. "And why, Madam, should that make you sorry?" "Why? Was not Dr. C. a Socinian or a Unitarian?" "Pray do not suffer yourself to be carried away by names. Whatever he was besides, he was an excellent Christian." He then read to her a passage from the Doctor's writings. "That sounds very well, Sir," she replied. "But might he not have written that to gain applause from men?" This, it is said, so displeased the divine, that he exercised the apostolic office of admonition so severely, that he put it to her conscience whether this uncharitable imputation, ascribing to the spirit of evil what came from the Holy Spirit, might not be the very unpardonable sin which theologians have made a theme for controversy: and with such effect was this reproof administered, that she never submitted to it a second time,—withdrew from the chapel, and not improbably spread among her neighbours the report that Mr. R. confessed himself a Unitarian. Had we thought him to be a Unitarian, in the sense in which that word is commonly used, and in which we are well pleased to accept it for ourselves, we could not honour his memory as we do. We hold in utter contempt that selfish class—if they be a class—who give and take, as in praise, the characteristic, that they think with the wise and talk with the vulgar—that is, when it implies the desire of obtaining at once the material rewards of conformity with vulgar prejudice, and the credit of a finer discernment. But we must not omit to preserve the balance between the illiberal of both classes by declaring, that we acknowledge little, if any, difference in spirit between the ignorant dogmatist who assumes that every one who deems Channing a Christian must himself be a Unitarian, and that other dogmatist—more culpable, because less ignorant—who assumes that Robertson could not have been a sincere clergyman, loving such Unitarians as Channing. The fear of giving countenance to either of these injurious suppositions has not deterred us from being early in bearing our testimony to his worth, satisfied that the now harmless misapprehension will soon subside. This is no novel occurrence in the history of sectarian controversy. Every age has had its liberal ministers in the Church, whom their narrow-minded brethren would expel, but whom we should not therefore have claimed as belonging to us, in the more confined sense of our denomination; preferring to consider them as

"For ever separate, yet for ever near,"

and not caring to ascertain whether thick or

"Thin partitions do the bounds divide."

It is not as a Unitarian, but as a Christian Reformer, our first and better title, be it recollected, that our obituary receives his name within its narrow space. That character we are certain he was most anxious to merit. A frame early exhausted by disease aggravated by excess of irritability in his nerves, removed him early from the field of active exertion, or he would have proved, we doubt not, also a Christian Reformer of great energy and to a vast extent, though those attempted reformations must have brought him within the field of controversy, which he, during his actual life, was anxious to shun.

We are aware of the perils to which this course is exposed, and as well of the temptation by which it is assailed as of the calumnies to which it is especially liable.

In stating our sense of his high worth, we carefully abstain from all points of controversy, and especially avoid any comparison between those who leave the Church, as many noble confessors have done, and those who remain in it from a sense of duty. Mr. Robertson, we learn from his friends, had an affectionate attachment to the Church, like that of a child to his parent, and by his early death has been spared a severe trial. Isaac Taylor, who was a convert from orthodox Dissent to the Church, declared that it must perish unless a second Reformation took place. We may without presumption be confident that had it been within the scheme of Providence that the struggle should arise between the Reformers and the supporters of the corruptions of the Church, Mr. Robertson would not have been found among those supporters; and, at the same time that we decline hazarding a speculation, which unhappily no one can either refute or confirm, declare our comparative indifference to the mode by which currently-received Christianity may be reformed—if it be but reformed. Even had we a decided opinion on these much disputed points, whether it is by or against the authority of the State—that is, the laity of the community—that a genuine Church can be instituted, such as the apostles laboured to establish—and how Christianity is to be rendered in *fact*, what it is in *idea*—if it were our function to attempt to decide these questions, it could not, at all events, be done in this page.